



## Staff Report

HEARING DATE: July 12, 2017

STAFF REPORT DATE: July 5, 2017

TO: Interested Parties

FROM: Steve Regner, Associate Planner *SR*

PROPOSAL: **Cedar Hills Park Redevelopment  
CU2017-0001 DR2017-0002 TP2017-0001**

LOCATION: The site is located North of SW Walker Road and east of SW Cedar Hills Boulevard; Tax Lot 10500 on Washington County Tax Assessor's Map 1S110BB, and Tax Lot 12000 on Washington County Tax Assessor's Map 1S110BC.

SUMMARY: The applicant, Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, requests approval for Design Review Three, Conditional Use for a public park in a Residential Zone, and Tree Plan Type 2 application for the reconstruction of Cedar Hills Park, with the removal of some trees from Significant Grove G37. Physical improvements include a lighted sport field, splash pad, community gardens, playgrounds, lighted sport courts, picnic shelters, restrooms, and surface parking.

APPLICANT/  
PROPERTY OWNER: Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District  
Matt Kilmartin  
6220 SW 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Beaverton, OR 97008

APPLICANT  
REPRESENTATIVE: MacKay Sposito  
Jim Sandlin  
1325 Tech Center Drive, Suite 140  
Vancouver, WA 98683

APPROVAL CRITERIA: New Conditional Use, Section 40.15.15.3.C  
Design Review Three, Section 40.20.15.3.C  
Tree Plan Two, Section 40.90.15.2.C

RECOMMENDATION: **APPROVAL of CU2017-0001 DR2017-0002 TP2017-0001  
(Cedar Hills Park Redevelopment).**

## BACKGROUND FACTS

### Key Information

The applicant, Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, proposes to redevelop the existing Cedar Hills Park. Design has been done in coordination with Beaverton School District, as the abutting William Walker Elementary School (WWES) is proposed for full redevelopment under a separate but concurrently reviewed land use application. Design and construction timelines will likely overlap to some extent. The WWES project proposes to develop some improvements on the park site. A shared access drive providing vehicle access to the school from Cedar Hills Boulevard and improvements to Cedar Hill Boulevard will be permitted and constructed by Beaverton School District under the WWES land use application. The park design is reliant on these improvements for full park functionality.

### Key Application Dates

Application	Submittal Date	Application Deemed Complete	Final Written Decision Date	240-Day*
CU2017-0002	January 12, 2017	May 17, 2017	September 14, 2017	January 12, 2018
CU2017-0002	January 12, 2017	May 17, 2017	September 14, 2017	January 12, 2018
TP2017-0002	January 12, 2017	May 17, 2017	September 14, 2017	January 12, 2018

\* Pursuant to Section 50.25.9 of the Development Code this is the latest date, with a continuance, by which a final written decision on the proposal can be made.

### Existing Conditions Table

<b>Zoning</b>	R7 Residential Urban Standard Density District (R7)	
<b>Current Development</b>	Public Park	
<b>Site Size &amp; Location</b>	The park site is north SW Walker Road and east of SW Cedar Hills Boulevard. The total park site is 11.88 acres.	
<b>NAC</b>	Central Beaverton	
<b>Surrounding Uses</b>	<b>Zoning:</b> <u>North:</u> Washington County R5 <u>South:</u> Washington County R5 <u>East:</u> City of Beaverton R7 Washington County R5 <u>West:</u> City of Beaverton General Commercial, Community Service.	<b>Uses:</b> <u>North:</u> Detached Residential <u>South:</u> Detached Residential <u>East:</u> Elementary School <u>West:</u> Commercial

## DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION AND TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b><u>Page No.</u></b>
<b><u>Attachment A:</u> Facilities Review Committee Technical Review and Recommendation Report</b>	FR1 – FR13
<b><u>Attachment B:</u> CU2017-0001 <i>New Conditional Use Permit</i></b>	CU1-CU4
<b><u>Attachment C:</u> DR2017-0002 <i>Design Review Three</i></b>	DR1-DR16
<b><u>Attachment D:</u> TP2017-0001 <i>Tree Plan Two</i></b>	TP1-TP11
<b><u>Attachment E:</u> <i>Conditions of Approval</i></b>	COA1-COA8

### **Exhibits**

#### **Exhibit 1. Materials submitted by Staff**

- Exhibit 1.1 Vicinity Map (page SR-4 of this report)
- Exhibit 1.2 Aerial Map (page SR-5 of this report)

#### **Exhibit 2. Comment from Reviewing Agencies**

- Exhibit 2.1 July 5, 2017 letter from Gary Stockhoff, Washington Country County Engineer supporting the interim improvements to SW Walker Road, as proposed by the applicant.

#### **Exhibit 3. Public Comment**

- Exhibit 3.1 June 23, 2017 letter from Nicholas Nelson, 2645 SW 121<sup>st</sup> Place, expressing concerns about park design, tree impacts, traffic through the park, and improvements not proposed on SW Walker Road.

#### **Exhibit 4. Materials submitted by the Applicant**

- Exhibit 4.1 Submittal Package including plans

Staff Report: July 5, 2017  
Cedar Hills Park Redevelopment





**Cedar Hills Park Redevelopment  
CU2017-0001 DR2017-0002 TP2017-0001  
Aerial Map**

**FACILITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE  
TECHNICAL REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
Cedar Hills Park Redevelopment  
CU2017-0001 DR2017-0002 TP2017-0001**

**Section 40.03 Facilities Review Committee:**

The Facilities Review Committee has conducted a technical review of the application, in accordance with the criteria contained in Section 40.03 of the Development Code. The Committee's findings and recommended conditions of approval are provided to the decision-making authority. As they will appear in the Staff Report, the Facilities Review Conditions may be re-numbered and placed in different order.

The decision-making authority will determine whether the application as presented meets the Facilities Review approval criteria for the subject application and may choose to adopt, not adopt, or modify the Committee's findings, below.

**The Facilities Review Committee Criteria for Approval will be reviewed for all criteria that are applicable to the submitted applications as identified below:**

- **All twelve (12) criteria are applicable to the submitted Design Review Three and Conditional Use Permit application as submitted.**
- **Facilities Review criteria do not apply to the Tree Plan Type Two application**

***A. All critical facilities and services related to the development have, or can be improved to have, adequate capacity to serve the proposal at the time of its completion.***

Chapter 90 of the Development Code defines "critical facilities" to be services that include public water, public sanitary sewer, storm water drainage and retention, transportation, and fire protection. The Committee finds that the proposal includes necessary on-site and off-site connections and improvements to public water and public sanitary sewer facilities. The applicant has provided a Service Provider Letter (SPL) from Clean Water Services which shows compliance with stormwater and wetland requirements.

Development of the subject site will rely on redevelopment of the abutting William Walker Elementary School, which includes construction of a shared access drive on the subject property.

Water Service will be provided to the site by Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD). Existing water service is available to serve the project site. The applicant proposes construct a new water line under the proposed shared access driveway out to Cedar Hills Boulevard to serve the park site.

The existing park receives sanitary sewer service from the City of Beaverton. A public line traverses through the center of the park. This existing line will be relocated under the proposed shared access driveway. Adequate capacity exists to serve the proposed

development.

Proposed stormwater drainage has been identified and described in the applicant's narrative and plans, including a Preliminary Storm Drainage Report, dated May 17, 2017, provided by MacKay Sposito. The park redevelopment proposes to address stormwater through a series of catch basins directing water to an at grade water quality facility pond in the southeast corner of the site. An additional underground detention facility is proposed underneath the multi-use playing field. The Committee has found the report and associated utility plans to be adequate in addressing the site's on-site surface water management (drainage patterns, treatment and quantity control).

To ensure appropriate design and construction of the essential facilities and utility connections, provide access to manholes and structures, and to ensure adequate maintenance requirements, the Committee recommends conditions of approval through the Design Review application.

Transportation Facilities are, by definition, Critical Facilities, and are required to have adequate capacity at or prior to completion of the proposed development. The applicant contracted with Charbonneau Engineering, LLC to prepare a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the combined school and park improvements. Based on the TIA, the park improvements are likely to generate 2 additional trips in the AM peak hour, 97 additional trips in the PM peak hour, and 143 additional trips to or from the site during the weekend peak hour.

With the proposed reconstruction of the park and school, the two property owners, Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD) and Beaverton School District (BSD) have agreed to install significant improvements to SW Cedar Hills Boulevard to accommodate the expected traffic. The two districts, in coordination with City and County transportation staff, analyzed multiple potential ways of addressing the traffic and access issues for the combined site. Ultimately, the consensus decision was to install a new traffic signal at the SW Cedar Hills Boulevard and SW Huntington Avenue intersection and bring almost all school traffic through the park. This is Access Plan C2, as described in the TIA. All of the parks expected vehicle traffic will use the access onto SW Cedar Hills Boulevard. Pedestrian and bicycle traffic will continue to come from all adjacent streets. The TIA shows that this intersection will meet the applicable mobility performance measures, once the signal and additional turn lanes have been installed. Beaverton School District will construct all Cedar Hills Park right of way improvements along the Cedar Hills Boulevard, including the signalized intersection at SW Huntington Avenue.

Additionally, there will be improvements to the SW Walker Road frontage of the park. This segment of SW Walker Road is designated as an Arterial Street, which is currently under the maintenance and operational jurisdiction of Washington County. The City and County Transportation System Plans (TSPs) show that the street is to be 5 lanes wide. As a condition of approval, THPRD will dedicate right-of-way along the SW Walker Road frontage of the park sufficient to provide 51 feet from centerline, construct an interim sidewalk along the SW Walker Road, as shown on sheet SP106 of the applicant's plans, and construct sidewalk ramps at the southeast corner of the intersection of SW Walker Road and SW 123<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. Currently, the ROW appears to be 30 feet wide, measured from the centerline of the street. Washington County and/or the City of Beaverton will

construct the additional pavement width and the required curb and gutter as part of a larger future road widening project. The Washington County Engineer has provided a letter supporting the design modification (Exhibit 2.1 of this Staff Report). However, staff notes that this letter does not amount to approval from the County for the sidewalk design. Additional review will be conducted by the County during their Facilities Permit review prior to permit issuance. Washington County has provided Conditions of Approval to address this additional review phase.

Washington County provides additional analysis regarding transportation as follows:

The park's existing access on SW Cedar Hills Boulevard will serve as a shared access with William Walker Elementary School. All buses, student drop-off/pick-up and park visitors will utilize the improved access on SW Cedar Hills Boulevard. Park and school traffic will not have access to SW Lynnfield Lane from the park with the exception of special events and emergency access only.

Washington County Traffic Engineering staff reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis (Charbonneau Engineering - September 2015) and supplemental Traffic Analysis (Kittleson – November 2016) submitted for this development proposal as required by Washington County R&O 86-95. The County Engineer concurs with the analysis and traffic mitigation measures identified in the applicant's Traffic Analysis and supplemental analysis.

The statewide Transportation Planning Rule requires provision for adequate transportation facilities in order for development to occur. Accordingly, the County has classified roads and road segments within the County system based upon their function. The current Transportation Plan (regularly updated) contains adequate right-of-way, road width and lane provision standards based upon each roadway's classification. Subject right of way is considered deficient if half-width of the existing right of way does not meet that determined necessary within the County's current transportation plan.

The applicant is required to dedicate additional right-of-way to provide a minimum of 55 feet from the centerline of SW Cedar Hills Boulevard and 51 feet from the centerline of SW Walker Road.

Resolution and Order No. 86-95 requires access points on collectors and arterials to be adequately illuminated.

This requirement will be met with the installation of continuous illumination along the site's frontage of SW Cedar Hills Boulevard.

Fire protection will be provided to the site by Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue Department (TVF&R). Comments and conditions of approval have been received from TVF&R. Conditions of approval submitted by TVF&R are included herein. Staff also cites the findings for Criterion H hereto regarding fire prevention.

The Committee finds that the development will provide required critical facilities, as conditioned. Therefore, the Committee finds the proposal meets the criterion for



approval.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that the proposal meets the criterion.**

***B. Essential facilities and services are available, or can be made available, with adequate capacity to serve the development prior to occupancy. In lieu of providing essential facilities and services, a specific plan may be approved if it adequately demonstrates that essential facilities, services, or both will be provided to serve the proposed development within five years of occupancy.***

Chapter 90 of the Development Code defines “essential facilities” to be services that include schools, transit improvements, police protection, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the public right-of-way.

The applicant proposes to redevelop an existing park. Construction of a park does not directly impact the capacity load on the local school system. However, the a portion of the park site is reserved for the construction of a shared access driveway, to be permitted and constructed by Beaverton School District as part of the William Walker Elementary redevelopment project.

The City of Beaverton Police will serve the development site. The Police Department has submitted no comments or recommendations to the Facilities Review Committee as of the date of this report. Any comments from the Police will be shared with the applicant team as soon as they are received.

Tri-Met will serve the development site. Tri-Met has submitted no comments or recommendations to the Facilities Review Committee. The site is most directly served by bus line 20 on SW Cedar Hills Boulevard. Tri-Met has not identified the need for additional transit stops related to this development.

Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Facilities are, by definition, Essential Facilities and are typically required to be in place prior to occupancy. Sidewalks are included in the Essential Facilities. As part of THPRD’s proposed changes to the park, they will install new concrete walkways and multi-use trails throughout the park. These will vary between 5 feet wide and 16.5 feet wide. They also propose to install a 4-foot wide asphalt trail through a portion of the existing tree grove. As noted above, City and County staff are requiring, as a condition of approval, the construction of an interim sidewalk along SW Walker Road.

Washington County provides additional analysis regarding transportation as follows:

Consistent with statewide pedestrian circulation/linkage goals of the Transportation Planning Rule and the County’s R&O 86-95 (road safety requirements), the County normally requires sidewalk installation as a minimum road safety improvement along site frontage of all County-maintained roads. Sidewalks further establish future street profiles, demarcate County or City right-of-way, and address drainage issues. Sidewalk requirements are not generally waived, even when sidewalk is not currently present on neighboring properties. Rather, even non-contiguous sidewalk is considered to provide some measure of pedestrian refuge and ideally, makes possible

eventual connection of sidewalks (as surrounding development takes place and is likewise conditioned to provide sidewalk). Additionally, the Washington County Road Design and Construction Standards require provision of adequate drainage along a site's frontage of a county road.

The subject site's frontage on SW Cedar Hills Boulevard is constructed with a half-street improvement, with the exception of street lighting, to County minimum standards. The City has required the replacement of the existing curb-tight sidewalk with a 10' sidewalk and street trees on the site's frontage of SW Cedar Hill Boulevard. Additionally, installation of continuous street lighting will be required to County standards. Staff notes that the Beaverton School District will be constructing the revised half-street as part of the new signalized intersection.

Improvements along the site's frontage of SW Walker Road are nonexistent. Construction of a 6 foot concrete sidewalk as proposed by MacKay/Sposito on sheet C106 dated 6-30-17 and roadside drainage (entire frontage) on SW Walker Road is required. Additionally, the applicant shall provide a pedestrian crossing with lighting on the eastside of SW 123rd Avenue to facilitate pedestrian traffic to/from the park's access (pedestrian only) on SW Walker Road.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.**

***C. The proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Chapter 20 (Land Uses) unless the applicable provisions are modified by means of one or more applications which shall be already approved or which shall be considered concurrently with the subject proposal.***

Staff cites the Code Conformance Analysis chart at the end of this report, which evaluates the project as it relates the applicable Code requirements of Chapter 20 for the R7 Residential Urban Standard Density District (R7) zone as applicable to the above mentioned criteria. As demonstrated on the chart, the development proposal meets all applicable standards.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.**

***D. The proposed development is consistent with all applicable provisions of Chapter 60 (Special Regulations) and all improvements, dedications, or both, as required by the applicable provisions of Chapter 60 (Special Regulations), are provided or can be provided in rough proportion to the identified impact(s) of the proposal.***

Staff cites the Code Conformance Analysis chart at the end of this report, which evaluates the proposal as it relates the applicable Code requirements of Chapter 60, in response to the above mentioned criteria.

**60.25 Off-Street Loading Requirements**

No loading berths or other off-street loading accommodations are required for public parks.

### 60.30 Off-Street Parking

Beaverton Development Code does not provide a specific ratio for public parks. As such, the applicant has provided a Parking Analysis under Exhibit J of the written materials. The analysis, dated February 28, 2017, conducted by Charbonneau Engineering, outlines projected parking needs based on programming of the proposed park. According to the analysis, the ITE Parking Generation Manual lacks sufficient data to development an accurate parking needs projection. As such, the applicant, THPRD, has conducted programming analysis, estimating parking spaced required per programmed element per hour. Both weekday and Saturday projects are provided, and are based on usage by other THPRD facilities most comparable in size and programming. The analysis concluded that no more than 50 parking spaces would be required on weekdays, and no more than 99 parking spaces would be required on Saturdays. The applicant's plans show 86 parking spaces on site. The applicant has further provided and intergovernmental agreement between THPRD and BSD (Exhibit I of the applicant's written materials), allowing park users to park on the William Walker Elementary School site between 4:30pm and 10:00 pm on school days, and dawn to 10:00 pm on non-school days. This provides an additional 43 parking spaces accessible from the shared access driveway that can be used by park users during peak hours.

All of the proposed vehicle parking spaces are at least 18 feet by nine feet (9') and there are eight ADA-compliant spaces shown. Both parking lots appear to comply with the applicable design standards for layout and dimensions.

### Section 60.55.10 General Provisions

All of the transportation facilities related to the proposal have been designed in accordance with the Engineering Design Manual and Standard Drawings. Some of the technical review of the proposed facilities' design will be deferred until the applicant submits engineering plans with the Site Development Permit, but the applicant has adequately addressed the preliminary issues identified by staff during the review of the land use applications.

For traffic calming on the proposed private common driveway, the park district and school district propose to install raised crosswalks.

The applicant's Traffic Impact Analysis shows that the affected intersections will continue to function within the acceptable performance ranges.

### Section 60.55.20 Traffic Impact Analysis

The applicant conducted a Traffic Impact Analysis, as required. The study met the applicable standards for scope, contents, analysis, and recommended mitigations.

### Section 60.55.25 Street and Bicycle and Pedestrian Connection Requirements

As noted in the applicant's responses to the Facilities Review approval criteria, the proposal provides for safe and efficient circulation and access for all modes of travel. Analysis of the pedestrian walkways for compliance with ADA provisions is typically a part of the Building Permit review, but preliminary analysis of the sidewalks and intersections shows that the site meets all applicable standards for accessibility. As a Condition of Approval, the applicant shall submit plans that include the construction of a sidewalk along the park's SW Walker Rd. frontage, as required by Washington County staff.

#### 60.60 Trees and Vegetation Requirements

Significant Grove G37 is located on the western portion of the subject site. The subject project proposes several amenities within the significant grove that will require removal or impact root zones of significant grove trees. These improvements include a three lane bocce court, loop path with picnic tables, a group shelter, sand volley ball courts, and a multiuse playing field. Due to the high level of programmed amenities for the proposed park, staff acknowledges the challenges of preserving the entirety of the grove. However, multiple amenities within the grove could easily be located elsewhere on the park site, preserving a dozen or more significant trees within the grove. Most specifically, the committee has identified the bocce court, loop path with picnic tables, and the group shelter as amenities within the grove that do not necessarily need to be located in the Significant Grove. While the applicant states that the other open areas are being proposed as lawn to support the splash pad, the committee is concerned that this proposal preserves lawn at the cost of significant grove trees. The committee recommends relocation or outright removal of these amenities for the purposes of preserving cohesive areas of the significant tree grove. See analysis in Tree Plan Two, Attachment D of this report, for additional findings.

This Grove will be further impacted by the proposed shared use driveway, providing vehicular access from SW Cedar Hills Boulevard to the new elementary school, and half street improvements to Cedar Hills Boulevard, including full intersection improvements at SW Cedar Hills Boulevard and SW Huntington Avenue. These improvements will be reviewed for land use approval under separate casefile, William Walker Elementary School Redevelopment, CU2017-0002 DR2017-0004 TP2017-0002.

The applicant's materials show that impacts to the Significant Grove fall below the minimum threshold for mitigation, when considering the subject project individually, as well as collectively with the William Walker Elementary School project which is being reviewed as a separate land use project. Therefore, no significant tree mitigation is required.

Section 60.60.15.2 of the Beaverton Development Code, which addresses removal and preservation standards, requires that significant groves be preserved in cohesive areas, referred to as Preservation Areas. The code further requires that Preservation Areas conditioned for protection through the Design Review process, shall be set aside in conservation easements. No such easements are proposed in with this project. The committee recommends that the remaining significant grove trees not removed with the development of this project or William Walker Elementary School Redevelopment project be preserved in tree protection easements.

The committee recommends standard conditions of approval for tree protection fencing during construction for trees identified for preservation.

#### 60.65 Utility Undergrounding

To meet the requirements of Section 60.65, staff recommends a standard condition of approval requiring that utility lines are placed underground.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.**

- E. Adequate means are provided or can be provided to ensure continued periodic maintenance and necessary normal replacement of the following private common facilities and areas, as applicable: drainage ditches, roads and other improved rights-of-way, structures, recreation facilities, landscaping, fill and excavation areas, screening and fencing, ground cover, garbage and recycling storage areas and other facilities not subject to maintenance by the City or other public agency.***

The Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, a public agency, is the applicant for the project and will be responsible for the maintenance of all on-site improvements. The Beaverton School District will construct the shared access drive across the park site, but THPRD will be responsible for the maintenance of the shared access drive on park property following construction. The proposal as represented does not present any barriers, constraints, or design elements that would prevent or preclude required maintenance of the private infrastructure and facilities on site.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that the proposal meets the criterion.**

- F. There are safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns within the boundaries of the development.***

As noted above in response to criteria A, B and D, the vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns within the boundaries of the site are safe and efficient for the operation of the proposed park.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.**

- G. The development's on-site vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems connect to the surrounding circulation systems in a safe, efficient, and direct manner.***

As noted above in response to criteria A, B and D, the vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems connect to the surrounding systems in a safe, efficient, and direct manner. New or improved pedestrian connections are proposed to both SW Cedar Hills Blvd. and SW Walker Rd. During non-school hours, there will be pedestrian and bicycle connections open to SW Lynnfield Ln. across the school property.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.**

- H. Structures and public facilities serving the development site are designed in accordance with adopted City codes and standards and provide adequate fire protection, including, but not limited to, fire flow.***

Preliminary comments and conditions of approval have been received from Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue District (TVF&R). Specific details regarding fire flow and hydrant



placement will be reviewed for flow calculations and hydrant locations during site development and building permit stages.

The Committee concludes that, subject to meeting the conditions of approval the site can be designed in accordance with City codes and standards and provide adequate fire protection.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.**

**I. Structures and public facilities serving the development site are designed in accordance with adopted City codes and standards and provide adequate protection from hazardous conditions due to inadequate, substandard or ill-designed development.**

The applicant shall be required to show a public street lighting plan prior to Site Development Permit issuance for the intersection of SW Walker Road and SW 123<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. By meeting the City of Beaverton's Engineering Design Manual design standards for street lights, the Committee finds that the street illumination system will provide adequate protection from crime and vehicle accidents. The applicants lighting plan will be discussed further within the Design Review staff report, as lighting relates to private drives and private common open space.

The proposed pathways will be adequately lighted to meet the minimum applicable Design Standards. The walkways and drive aisles have been designed to meet the applicable Engineering Design Standards.

The Committee finds that review of the construction documents at the building and site development permit stages will ensure protection from hazardous conditions due to inadequate, substandard or ill-designed development.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.**

**J. Grading and contouring of the development site is designed to accommodate the proposed use and to mitigate adverse effect(s) on neighboring properties, public right-of-way, surface drainage, water storage facilities, and the public storm drainage system.**

The applicant's response to Criterion J states that the grading has been designed to accommodate the new park and amenities, and that grading at the site perimeter would not change the flow of drainage. Grading has been designed in coordination with the William Walker Elementary School Redevelopment project, and will share stormwater facilities when both projects are completed.

The applicant must show compliance with Site Development erosion control measure at the time of Site Development permit issuance.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.**

***K. Access and facilities for physically handicapped people are incorporated into the development site and building design, with particular attention to providing continuous, uninterrupted access routes.***

The applicant will be required to meet all applicable accessibility standards of the International Building Code, Fire Code and other standards as required by the American Disabilities Act (ADA). Conformance with the technical design standards for Code accessibility requirements are to be shown on the approved construction plans associated with Site Development and Building Permit approvals. The Committee finds that as proposed, the street sidewalks and walkways internal to the development appear to meet applicable accessibility requirements and through the site development and building permitting reviews will be thoroughly evaluated. Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the site will be in conformance with ADA requirements, and would thereby be in conformance with Development Code Section 60.55.65 and the criterion will be met.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion for approval.**

***L. The proposal contains all applicable application submittal requirements as specified in Section 50.25.1 of the Development Code.***

The applicant submitted the applications on January 12, 2017 and was deemed complete on May 17, 2017. In the review of the materials during the application review, the Committee finds that all applicable application submittal requirements, identified in Section 50.25.1 are contained within this proposal.

**Therefore, the Committee finds the proposal meets the criterion for approval.**

# Code Conformance Analysis

## Chapter 20 Use and Site Development Requirements

### R7 Residential Urban Standard Density District (R7) Zoning District

CODE STANDARD	CODE REQUIREMENT	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS CODE?
Development Code Section 20.20.20. Land Uses – R7			
Use, Conditionally Permitted	Public Recreational Facility	The applicant proposes a Community.	<b>YES w/ CU</b>
Development Code Section 20.20.15. Site Development Standards – R7			
Land Area Minimum	7,000	Approximately 330,000 square feet	<b>Yes</b>
Lot Dimensions Minimum	Width: 70 feet Depth: 80 feet	Width: 830 feet Depth: 650 feet	<b>N/A</b>
Yard Setbacks Minimum	Front: 15 feet Side: 5 feet Rear: 25 feet	Front: 15 feet Side: 5 feet Rear: 25 feet	<b>N/A</b>
Building Height Maximum	35'	All proposed structures are under 35 feet tall	<b>YES</b>

## Chapter 60 Special Requirements

CODE STANDARD	CODE REQUIREMENT	PROJECT PROPOSAL	MEETS CODE?
Development Code Section 60.05			
Design Review Principles, Standards, and Guidelines	Requirements for new development and redevelopment.	Design Review standards and guidelines will be reviewed in the Design Review portion of the staff report.	<b>See Findings for DR2017-0004</b>
Development Code Section 60.07			
Drive-Up window facilities	Requirements for drive-up, drive-through and drive-in facilities.	No drive-up window facilities are proposed.	<b>N/A</b>
Development Code Section 60.10			
Floodplain Regulations	Requirements for properties located in floodplain, floodway, or floodway fringe.	No mapped floodplains are located within the subject site.	<b>N/A</b>
Development Code Section 60.12			
Habitat Friendly and Low Impact Development Practices	Optional program offering various credits available for use of specific Habitat Friendly or Low Impact Development techniques.	No Habitat Friendly or Low Impact Development techniques proposed.	<b>N/A</b>
Development Code Section 60.15 – Land Division Standards			
Land Division Standards	Standards pertaining to Land Divisions	No Land Divisions are proposed or required.	<b>N/A</b>
Development Code Section 60.25 – Off Street Loading			
Loading Facilities	No loading facilities Necessary	No loading facilities proposed	<b>N/A</b>
Development Code Section 60.30 – Off-Street Parking			
Off-street motor vehicle parking Parking Zone A	Total Required: 0 Spaces	<u>Vehicle Parking</u> 86 spaces provided. Applicant analysis shows need for 50 spaces on weekdays, 99 spaces on Saturdays. BSD and THPRD agreement provides additional 43 spaces on William Walker Elementary site when school is out.	<b>YES</b>
Required Bicycle Park	Long Term Total: 0 Spaces	<u>Bicycle Parking</u> Short Term: 12 Long Term: 0	
Compact Spaces	Required residential parking must be provided at standard sizes.	No compact parking spaces are proposed.	<b>N/A</b>
Development Code Section 60.55 - Transportation			
Transportation Facilities	Regulations pertaining to the construction or reconstruction of transportation facilities.	Refer to Facilities Review Committee findings herein.	<b>Yes- with COA</b>

Development Code Section 60.60			
Trees & Vegetation	Regulations pertaining to the removal and preservation of trees.	<p>By staff assessment, 54 Significant Grove trees are proposed to be removed.</p> <p>By staff assessment, 37 Community Trees are proposed to be removed.</p>	<p><b>See Findings for TP2017-0001</b></p>
Development Code Section 60.65			
Utility Undergrounding	All existing overhead utilities and any new utility service lines within the project and along any existing frontage, except high voltage lines (>57kV) must be placed underground.	To ensure the proposal meets requirements of this section, staff recommends a condition requiring undergrounding completion prior to occupancy.	<p><b>Yes- with COA</b></p>



**CU2017-0001  
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS FOR  
CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL**

**Section 40.03.1 Facilities Review Approval Criteria:**

*The applicant for development must establish that the application complies with all relevant standards in conformance with Section 50.25.1.B and all the following criteria have been met:*

**Facilities Review Approval Criteria Section 40.03.1.A-L**

Staff has reviewed the applicable Facilities Review criteria in Attachment A to this report. Staff cites the findings presented in Attachment A in response to the Facilities Review approval criteria. As identified in Attachment A, above, the proposal meets Criteria A-L, and therefore meets the criterion for approval.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that the proposal meets the criteria.**

**Section 40.15.15.3.C New Conditional Use Approval Criteria:**

*In order to approve a New Conditional Use application, the decision making authority shall make findings of fact based on evidence provided by the applicant demonstrating that all the following criteria are satisfied:*

***1. The proposal satisfies the threshold requirements for a Conditional Use application.***

The applicant proposes a Community Park in the R7 Residential Urban Standard Density District (R7) zone. Public Recreation Facilities in this zone require a Conditional Use permit. The existing property was annexed into the City of Beaverton in 2001, and no Conditional Use permit was found with Washington County. Therefore, the replacement school is being treated as a new Conditional Use permit

**Therefore, staff finds the proposal meets the criterion for approval.**

***2. All City application fees related to the application under consideration by the decision making authority have been submitted.***

The applicant paid the required fee associated with a New Conditional Use application.

**Therefore, staff finds the proposal meets the criterion for approval.**

***3. The proposal will comply with the applicable policies of the Comprehensive Plan.***

The applicant identified the following applicable Comprehensive Plan Policies, but states that there are no conflicts with any of the policies identified.

**5.8.1. *Cooperate with THPRD in implementation of it's 20-year Comprehensive Master Plan and Trails Master Plan in order to ensure adequate parks and recreation facilities and programs for current and future City residents.***

The applicant states that the development of the park supports the policies under this goal, by responding to the recreation needs of the area while acknowledging the limited supply of land in the city. The IGA with BSD creates efficiencies of public partnerships, allowing for shared use of facilities to maximize public benefits of the proposed improvements.

**6.2.1. *Transportation facilities designed and constructed in a manner to enhance Beaverton's livability and meet federal, state, regional, and local requirements.***

The applicant states that proposed transportation facilities enhance livability by:

- Providing access to William Walker Elementary School through the park, lessening the strain on SW Lynnfield Lane.
- Enhancing the pedestrian access from SW Lynnfield Lane to SW Cedar Hills Boulevard by way of a multi-use path. Furthermore, access to SW Walker Road is improved through additional new pathways in the park.
- Dedication of right-of-way on SW Cedar Hills Boulevard to accommodate frontage improvements and future Washington County street improvement project.
- Maintaining Tri-Met access on SW Cedar Hills Boulevard.
- Providing safe bicycle and pedestrian routes through the park.

Staff concurs that these features increase the livability of the neighborhood served by the park.

**6.2.2. *A balanced multimodal transportation system that provides mobility and accessibility for users.***

The applicant states that this project enhances mobility and accessibility for users by:

- Enhancing walkability
- Providing safe crossings at intersections
- Providing direct access to TriMet bus stop
- Developing neighborhood and local connections which provide convenient circulation into and out of neighborhoods.
- Adjusting parking lot designs to be more pedestrian-friendly.
- Including pedestrian, bicycle, and transit-supportive improvements within the proposed development and adjacent rights-of-ways in accordance with adopted policies and standards.

Staff concurs that these features increase the mobility and accessibility for users.

**6.2.3. *A safe transportation system.***

The applicant states that this project contributes to a safe transportation system by:

- Providing traffic calming measures along the school and park access drive.
- Extending the public sidewalk along Walker Rd.
- Providing safe walkway and bikeway routes from residential areas to schools, parks, transit, and other activity centers.

- Ensuring that adequate access for emergency services vehicles is provided to the park and school.
- Maintaining access management standards for streets consistent with City and County, and requirements to reduce conflicts among vehicles, trucks, bicycles, and pedestrians.

Staff concurs that these features contributes to a safe transportation system.

#### ***8.4.1 Create and protect a healthy acoustical environment within the City..***

The applicant states that among the ways that the park development has addressed protecting a healthy acoustical environment within the neighborhood is by:

- Limiting the hours of operations of the park. The Athletic Fields will be programed to limit their night use to 10:00 pm.
- Locating the highest generating noise sources (Athletic Field) to the furthest point away from the residential properties. Uses nearest the residential properties will be limited to use from dawn until dusk.
- Providing ample planting throughout the park to help mitigate, mask and buffer sources of noise generated within the park.
- Limiting speed of vehicular traffic circulating within the park and to WWES.
- Using textured building materials and buffer planting to reduce and absorb noise.

Staff concurs that these efforts contributes to a healthy acoustical environment.

**Therefore, staff finds the proposal meets the criterion for approval.**

#### ***4. The size, dimensions, configuration, and topography of the site and natural and man-made features on the site can reasonably accommodate the proposal.***

The applicant states that site plan demonstrates that the proposed park programming, including access, parking, circulation, and athletic fields there are no topographic constraints present that would prohibit the proposal.

Staff concurs with the applicant's statement, and further notes that as shown on Sheets SP100-SP106 of the submitted plans, the site can reasonably accommodate the proposed park, associated parking areas, circulation systems and athletic fields while meeting all required setbacks, site buffering and other design review guidelines.

Further analysis of Design Guidelines are addressed in the Design Review Findings and Analysis beginning on page DR1 below.

**Therefore, staff finds the proposal meets the criterion for approval.**

#### ***5. The location, size, and functional characteristics of the proposal are such that it can be made reasonably compatible with and have minimal impact on livability and appropriate use and development of properties in the surrounding area of the subject site.***

The applicant states that the site program is designed to minimize impacts to adjacent properties while enhancing the recreational opportunities and facilities lacking within the community overall. Amenities that generate the highest levels of noise and lighting have been located furthest away from abutting residential properties.

Staff finds that the size, location and functional characteristics of the proposal are reasonably compatible with and have minimal impact on surrounding uses.

**Therefore, staff finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the criterion is met.**

**6. *Applications and documents related to the request, which will require further City approval, shall be submitted to the City in the proper sequence.***

The applicant has submitted all documents related to this request for New Conditional Use approval. Design Review Three and Tree Plan Two applications are being processed concurrently with the subject request for Design Review Three approval. No additional applications or documents are needed at this time.

**Therefore, staff finds that by meeting the conditions of approval, the criterion is met.**

**Recommendation**

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommend **APPROVAL** of **CU2017-0001 (Cedar Hills Park Redevelopment)**, subject to the applicable conditions identified in Attachment E

**DR2017-0002  
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS FOR  
DESIGN REVIEW THREE APPROVAL**

**Section 40.03.1 Facilities Review Approval Criteria:**

*The applicant for development must establish that the application complies with all relevant standards in conformance with Section 50.25.1.B and all the following criteria have been met:*

**Facilities Review Approval Criteria Section 40.03.1.A-L**

Staff has reviewed the applicable Facilities Review criteria in Attachment A to this report. Staff cites the findings presented in Attachment A in response to the Facilities Review approval criteria. As identified in Attachment A, above, the proposal meets Criteria A-L, and therefore meets the criterion for approval.

**Therefore, the Committee finds that the proposal meets the criteria.**

**Planning Commission Standards for Approval:**

Section 40.20.15.3.C of the Development Code provides standards to govern the decisions of the Commission as they evaluate and render decisions on Design Review Applications. The Commission will determine whether the application as presented, meets the Design Review Three approval criteria. The Commission may choose to adopt, not adopt or modify the Committee's findings. In this portion of the report, staff evaluates the application in accordance with the criteria for Type 3 Design Review.

**Section 40.20.15.3.C Approval Criteria:** In order to approve a Design Review Three application, the decision making authority shall make findings of fact based on evidence provided by the applicant demonstrating that all the following criteria are satisfied:

**1. *The proposal satisfies the threshold requirements for a Design Review Three application.***

The applicant proposes to redevelop an existing park in residential zone. This could potentially meet the threshold for a Type Two Design Review. However, the applicant notes that some Design Standards cannot be met. Therefore, the application will be reviewed as a Design Review Three application under Threshold 8.

*8. A project meeting the Design Review Two thresholds which does not meet an applicable design standard.*

**Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.**



2. ***All City application fees related to the application under consideration by the decision making authority have been submitted.***

The applicant paid the required fees for a Design Review Three application.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

3. ***For proposals meeting Design Review Three application thresholds numbers 1 through 6, the proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Sections 60.05.35 through 60.05.50 (Design Guidelines).***

The project proposal meets application Threshold #8 and, accordingly, is not subject to this approval criteria.

Therefore, staff find the criterion is not applicable.

4. ***For additions to or modifications of existing development, the proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Sections 60.05.35 through 60.05.50 (Design Guidelines) or can demonstrate that the additions or modifications are moving towards compliance of specific Design Guidelines if any of the following conditions exist:***

- a. A physical obstacle such as topography or natural feature exists and prevents the full implementation of the applicable guideline; or***
- b. The location of existing structural improvements prevent the full implementation of the applicable guideline; or***
- c. The location of the existing structure to be modified is more than 300 feet from a public street.***

The project proposal is a full park redevelopment. Therefore, this criterion which pertains to additions or modification of existing development does not apply.

Therefore, staff find the criterion is not applicable.

5. ***For DRBCP proposals which involve the phasing of required floor area, the proposed project shall demonstrate how future development of the site, to the minimum development standards established in this Code or greater, can be realistically achieved at ultimate build out of the DRBCP.***

The applicant does not propose a DRBCP.

Therefore, staff find the criterion is not applicable.

6. ***For proposals meeting Design Review Three application Threshold numbers 7 or 8, where the applicant has decided to address a combination of standards and guidelines, the proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Sections 60.05.15 through 60.05.30 (Design Standards) except for the Design Standard(s) where the proposal is instead subject to the applicable corresponding Design Guideline(s). [ORD 4531; March 2010]***

The project proposal meets application Threshold #8. However, the applicant has elected to address Design Guidelines only.

**Therefore, staff find the criterion is not applicable.**

7. ***For proposals meeting Design Review Three application Threshold numbers 7 or 8, the proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Sections 60.05.15 through 60.05.30 (Design Standards) except for the Design Standard(s) where the proposal is applying to instead meet the applicable Design Guideline(s).***

The project proposal meets application Threshold #8. The applicant has elected to address Design Guidelines only. Staff cites the Design Guidelines Analysis at the end of this Design Review section, which evaluates the project as it relates the applicable Design Review Guidelines found in Section 60.05 of the Development Code. Staff reviews each Guideline with respect to the applicability of the Guideline to the project, the applicant's response, and illustrative representation of the proposal. Staff provides an evaluation of the proposal in relation to the Guideline and a statement as to whether the Guideline is met below. Staff finds that the proposal meets the Guidelines.

**Therefore, staff finds that by meeting the conditions of approval the criterion is met.**

8. ***Applications and documents related to the request, which will require further City approval, shall be submitted to the City in the proper sequence.***

The applicant has submitted all documents related to this request for Design Review Three approval. New Conditional Use and Tree Plan Two applications are being processed concurrently with the subject request for Design Review Three approval. No additional applications or documents are needed at this time.

**Therefore, staff find the criterion is met.**

## DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES ANALYSIS

In the following analysis, staff have only identified the Design Guidelines which are relevant to the subject development proposal. Non-relevant Guidelines have been omitted.

**60.05.35 *Building Design and Orientation Guidelines.*** *Unless otherwise noted, all guidelines apply in all zoning districts.*

### **1. *Building Elevation Design Through Articulation and Variety***

**B.** *Building elevations should be varied and articulated to provide visual interest to pedestrians. Within larger projects, variations in architectural elements such as: building elevations, roof levels, architectural features, and exterior finishes should be provided. (Standard 60.05.15.1.A and B)*

Proposed structures are accessory in nature. The two restrooms are CMU block construction, with steel and wood privacy screens. One restroom also contains a concessions window. Buildings are less than 15' tall, and are intended for pedestrian use.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

**C.** *To balance horizontal features on longer building elevations, vertical building elements, such as building entries, should be emphasized. (Standard 60.05.15.1.B)*

Proposed structures are accessory in nature. Elevations are 28 feet long, therefore do require significant vertical balancing. However, vertical elements include the privacy screen for bathroom entrances.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

**D.** *Buildings should promote and enhance a comfortable pedestrian scale and orientation. This guideline does not apply to buildings in industrial districts where the principal use of the building is manufacturing, assembly, fabricating, processing, packing, storage, wholesale or distribution activities. (Standard 60.05.15.1.B) [ORD 4531; March 2010]*

Proposed structures are accessory in nature, designed for pedestrian interaction. Buildings include two public entrances for restrooms, and one of the buildings contains a walk-up concession window.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

**E.** *Building elevations visible from and within 200 feet of an adjacent street or major parking area should be articulated with architectural features such as windows, dormers, off-setting walls, alcoves, balconies or bays, or by other design features*

*that reflect the building's structural system. Undifferentiated blank walls facing a street, common green, shared court, or major parking area should be avoided. (Standards 60.05.15.1.B, C, and D) [ORD 4542; May 2010]*

Proposed structures are accessory in nature, and utilize wood and metal privacy screens to provide additional visual articulation.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

## **2. Roof Forms as Unifying Elements**

A. *Roof forms should be distinctive and include variety and detail when viewed from the street. Sloped roofs should have a significant pitch and building focal points should be highlighted. (Standards 60.05.15.2.A and B)*

Proposed structures are accessory in nature. The restrooms utilize sloped roofs for visual interest and ventilation.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

B. *Flat roofs should include distinctive cornice treatments. (Standard 60.05.15.2.C)*

The proposed structures do not utilize flat roofs.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is not applicable.**

## **3. Primary building entrances**

A. *Excluding manufacturing, assembly, fabricating, processing, packing, storage and wholesale and distribution activities which are the principle use of a building in industrial districts, the design of buildings should incorporate features such as arcades, roofs, porches, alcoves, porticoes, awnings, and canopies to protect pedestrians from the rain and sun. (Standard 60.05.15.3.A)*

Proposed structures are accessory in nature and intended for use by park patrons. Weather protection proposed is limited to roof overhangs of a few feet. Users of the restrooms would receive some weather protection from these overhangs.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

B. *Special attention should be given to designing a primary building entrance that is both attractive and functional. Primary entrances should incorporate changes in mass, surface, or finish to emphasize the entrance. (Standard 60.05.15.3.B)*

Proposed structures are accessory in nature, and utilize wood and metal privacy

screens to provide additional visual articulation at the restroom entrances.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

#### **4. Exterior Building Materials**

A. *Exterior building materials and finishes should convey an impression of permanence and durability. Materials such as masonry, stone, wood, terra cotta, and tile are encouraged. Windows are also encouraged, where they allow views to interior activity areas or displays. (Standard 60.05.15.4.A)*

Proposed structures are accessory in nature. Building materials include CMU block, wood, and steel.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

B. *Where masonry is used for exterior finish, decorative patterns (other than running bond pattern) should be considered, especially at entrances, building corners and at the pedestrian level. These decorative patterns may include multi-colored masonry units, such as brick, tile, stone, or cast stone, in a layered or geometric pattern, or multi-colored ceramic tile bands used in conjunction with materials such as concrete. This guideline does not apply to developments in Industrial zones, where masonry is used for exterior finishes. (Standards 60.05.15.4.B and C)*

Proposed structures are accessory in nature, and are not the dominant feature of the project site. Structures are less than 900 square feet in size. While running bond CMU block is the dominant design of several of the building elevations, the small scale of the structures do not necessitate decorative or geometric patterns.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

#### **5. Screening of Equipment.** *All roof, surface, and wall-mounted mechanical, electrical, communications, and service equipment should be screened from view from adjacent public streets by the use of parapets, walls, fences, enclosures, dense evergreen foliage, or by other suitable means. (Standards 60.05.15.5.A through C)*

Mechanical rooms are located within the structures. No exterior mechanical equipment is proposed with these accessory structures.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**



**60.05.40. Circulation and Parking Design Guidelines.** *Unless otherwise noted, all guidelines apply in all zoning districts.*

- 1. Connections to public street system.** *The on-site circulation system and the abutting street system should provide for efficient access and circulation, and should connect the project to abutting streets. (Standard 60.05.40.1)*

The applicant states that the proposed on-site circulation system connects to the surrounding street system. The proposal will connect to the shared access drive, proposed by the abutting William Walker Elementary School project, for pedestrians and automobiles west of the school, connecting to SW Cedar Hills Boulevard. The school project will also construct a fully signalized intersection at SW Cedar Hills Boulevard and SW Huntington. Additionally, the school project will construct frontage improvements for SW Cedar Hills Boulevard.

Furthermore, the applicant is proposing to construct limited, interim, frontage improvements to SW Walker Road, for the purposes of safe pedestrian travel across the segment of SW Walker Road upon which the park fronts. As discussed in the Facilities Review analysis, Washington County has identified this segment of SW Walker Road for future widening and improvements. As such, full half street improvements are deferred for this project. Internal pathways will connect to this improvement.

Finally, the proposal includes a portion of a multi-use path that will ultimately provide a reasonably direct bicycle and pedestrian connection from SW Lynnfield Lane to SW Cedar Hills Boulevard. The remainder of the multi-use path will be constructed with the William Walker Elementary School redevelopment project.

The proposal can be found to adequately connect to the public transportation system.

**Therefore, staff find that by meeting the conditions of approval the Guideline is met.**

- 2. Loading area, solid waste facilities, and similar improvements.**

- A. On-site service, storage and similar activities should be designed and located so that these facilities are screened from an abutting public street. (Standard 60.05.20.2)**

The trash enclosures and temporary restroom screens are located adjacent to the northern parking lot, close to SW Cedar Hills Boulevard. These screens, constructed of metal and wood, are located for easy access for park patrons and maintenance.. Staff concurs that the temporary restroom area and trash enclosure is appropriately located and adequately screened from public view.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

B. *Except in Industrial districts, loading areas should be deigned and located so that these facilities are screened from an abutting public street, or are shown to be compatible with local business operations. (Standard 60.05.20.2)*

No loading areas are required for public parks. No loading areas are proposed.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is not applicable.**

### **3. *Pedestrian circulation.***

A. *Pedestrian connections should be made between on-site buildings, parking areas, and open spaces. (Standard 60.05.20.3.A)*

The applicant provides a series of pedestrian connections and paths throughout the site connecting shared access drive, accessory structures entrances, and parking areas to each other and to the public street system in SW Cedar Hills Boulevard and SW Walker Road. The pedestrian connections through the development and to adjacent streets are sufficient.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

B. *Pedestrian connections should connect on-site facilities to abutting pedestrian facilities and streets unless separated by barriers such as natural features, topographical conditions, or structures. (Standard 60.05.20.3.A)*

The applicant provides connections to all adjacent public streets which are direct and logical given the slopes of the site. Staff concurs with the applicant that sufficient pedestrian connections to adjacent streets and pedestrian facilities.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

C. *Pedestrian connections should link building entrances to nearby streets and other pedestrian destinations. (Standard 60.05.20.3.B)*

The applicant provides direct pedestrian connections from streets to accessory building entrances with paved pathways. Staff concur that pedestrian connections are provided to adjacent public streets.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

*D. Pedestrian connections to streets through parking areas should be evenly spaced and separated from vehicles (Standard 60.05.20.3.C through E)*

The applicant provides pedestrian connections in the northern parking lot to reach the internal pathway of the park. The southern parking lot is framed by a pedestrian pathways, and park users would only need to cross one drive aisle to reach a pedestrian pathway. The marked connections as shown on the plans are adequately spaced and located for safe pedestrian movements through parking lots.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

*E. Excluding manufacturing, assembly, fabricating, processing, packing, storage and wholesale and distribution activities which are the principle use of a building in industrial districts, pedestrian connections designed for high levels of pedestrian activity should be provided along all streets. (Standard 60.05.20.3.A through H)*

The applicant provides sidewalks along all public streets as well as an extensive internal pedestrian walkway system. Staff concurs that the pedestrian system is adequate.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

*F. Pedestrian connections should be designed for safe pedestrian movement and constructed of hard durable surfaces. (Standards 60.05.20.3.F through G)*

Pedestrian ways are designed for safe movement and constructed with hard surface materials. Where pedestrian access crosses drive aisles, marked crosswalks, either at grade or raised are used to differentiate the driving surface to ensure pedestrian safety. Detectable warnings are used where there are conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular conflicts. Staff concurs that the applicant has proposed hard durable differentiated surfaces for pedestrian connections.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

**4. *Street frontages and parking areas.* Landscape or other screening should be provided when surface parking areas are located along public streets. (Standard 60.05.20.4)**

The northern parking lot is proposed adjacent to SW Cedar Hills Boulevard. The landscape plan on sheet L101 shows three foot tall evergreen screening in front of parking stalls that are oriented towards the public street.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

5. ***Parking area landscaping.*** *Landscape islands and a tree canopy should be provided to minimize the visual impact of large parking areas.* (Standard 60.05.20.5.A through D)

The applicant proposes landscape islands containing trees and ground cover. The applicant states that the landscape islands and surrounding vegetation are designed to provide shade and soften the edges of the parking areas. Staff concurs that the landscaping as shown effectively minimizes the visual impact of the parking lots.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

8. ***Connect on-site buildings, parking, and other improvements with identifiable streets and drive aisles in Residential, Multiple Use, and Commercial districts.***

- A. *On-site circulation should be easily recognized and identified, and include a higher level of improvements such as curbs, sidewalks, and landscaping compared to parking lot aisles.* (Standard 60.05.20.8)

The proposal connects to public streets and sidewalk system in an easily recognized manner. Curbs and sidewalks are included in the design. All crosswalks will be concrete or other paving treatments to differentiate from the vehicular pavement.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

- B. *Long, continuous parking aisles should be avoided if possible, and landscaped as necessary to minimize the visual impact.* (Standard 60.05.20.8)

Parking aisles are broken up by landscaping and are generally small in scale.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

**60.05.45. *Landscape, Open Space and Natural Areas Design Guidelines.*** *Unless otherwise noted, all guidelines apply in all zoning districts.*

2. ***Minimum landscaping in Residential zones.***

- A. *Landscape treatments utilizing plants, hard-surface materials, or both should be provided in the setback between a street and a building. The treatment should enhance architectural elements of the building and contribute to a safe, interesting streetscape.* (Standard 60.05.25.4)

The project as proposed provides a variety of shrubs and ground cover as well as street trees and landscape trees to create interesting views from both SW Cedar Hills Boulevard SW Walker Road.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

*B. Landscaping should soften the edges of buildings and parking areas, add aesthetic interest, and generally increase the attractiveness of a development and its surroundings. (Standard 60.05.25.4)*

The project as proposed provides a variety of shrubs and ground cover as well as landscape trees around parking lots. Structures are small scale and accessory in nature.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

**3. *Minimum landscaping for conditional uses in Residential districts and for developments in Multiple Use, Commercial, and Industrial Districts.***

*A. Landscaping should soften the edges of buildings and parking areas, add aesthetic interest and generally increase the attractiveness of a development and its surroundings. (Standard 60.05.25.3.A, B, and D)*

The project as proposed provides a variety of shrubs and ground cover as well as landscape trees around parking lots. Structures are small scale and accessory in nature.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

*B. Plazas and common areas designed for pedestrian traffic should be surfaced with a combination of landscape and decorative pavers or decorative concrete. (Standard 60.05.25.3.C)*

The proposed project is a public park. The site as a whole has been designed for pedestrian traffic.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

*C. Use of native vegetation should be emphasized for compatibility with local and regional climatic conditions. (Standard 60.05.25.3.A and B)*

The applicant uses a variety of vegetation on site to serve different purposes, including groundcover, screening, stormwater treatment, and ornamentation. A mix of native and adaptive plants are shown the landscape schedule on sheet L107.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

D. *Existing mature trees and vegetation should be retained and incorporated, when possible, into the site design of a development.* (Standard 60.05.25.3.A and B)

A majority of Significant Grove 37, located at the west end of the site, is to be retained. See Tree Plan Two analysis in Attachment C of this report for further findings. The remainder of the site is expected to be graded and replanted with new landscaping.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

E. *A diversity of tree and shrub species should be provided in required landscaped areas.* (Standard 60.05.25.3)

The applicant provides a landscape schedule on sheet L107, demonstrating 12 different on-site trees, and approximately 70 different shrubs, grasses, and groundcover.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

6. ***Retaining Walls.*** *Retaining walls over six (6) feet in height or greater than fifty (50) feet in length should be architecturally treated, incorporated into the overall landscape plan, or screened by landscape material.* (Standard 60.05.25.5)

The applicant provides retaining walls over six feet tall in two locations. One wall is located on the north side of the site near the abutting racquet ball court, which is composed of an Ultrablock Gravity Wall system. The other walls, located at the south end of multi-use field and portions of the volleyball court, will be composed of a smaller concrete block retaining wall system. Both products come in a variety of finishes and colors. No final design has been provided with this application. Staff recommends a condition of approval that all retaining walls longer than 50 feet in length or taller than six feet be treated and finished with a contrasting scoring, textured, and/or color pattern.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

7. ***Fences and Walls***

- A. *Fences and walls should be constructed of attractive, durable materials.* (Standard 60.05.25.6)

The applicant states that fences will be constructed primarily of vinyl coated chain link and walls will be constructed of concrete block.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

*B. Fences and walls constructed in front yards adjacent to public streets should provide the opportunity to view into the setback from the street unless high traffic volumes or other conflicts warrant greater security and protection. (Standard 60.05.25.6)*

No new fences or walls are proposed along SW Cedar Hills Boulevard, except for a chain link fence surrounding the sport court. Fencing is proposed along SW Walker Road, but will be chain link with no slat to all for visual access into the site.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

- 8. *Changes to existing on-site surface contours at residential property lines.*** *The perimeters of properties should be graded in a manner to avoid conflicts with abutting residential properties such as drainage impacts, damage to tree root zones, and blocking sunlight. (Standard 60.05.25.10)*

The applicant states that the proposed grading has been designed to avoid drainage issues, unnecessary tree impacts, and blocking of sunlight. The applicant has provided a technical stormwater analysis with their application which adequately addresses stormwater on the site, as well as an arborist report discussing root zone impacts.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

- 9. *Integrate water quality, quantity or both facilities.*** *Aboveground stormwater detention and treatment facilities should be integrated into the design of a development site and, if visible from a public street, should appear as a component of the landscape design. (Standard 60.05.25.11)*

The applicant proposes an above ground stormwater facility in the southeast corner of the site. The landscape schedule on sheet L107 demonstrates the variety of plantings that give the appearance of a landscape amenity.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

- 10. *Natural Areas.*** *Natural features that are indigenous to a development site, such as streams, wetlands, and matures trees should be preserved, enhanced and integrated when reasonably possible into the development plan. (Standard 60.05.25.12)*

Significant Grove 37, located on the west edge of the property, will be impacted by the park amenities. The multiuse field will impact the edges of the grove. Additional amenities including picnic tables, asphalt paths, group shelter, and bocce ball courts are located more internally to the Significant Grove. As discussed further in findings for Tree Plan Two, under Attachment D, the applicant has not demonstrated that the park amenities centrally located within the Significant Grove. Therefore, staff recommends a condition of approval requiring the relocation or removal of the ADA accessible picnic tables, asphalt path, bocce court, and group shelter.

**Therefore, staff find that by meeting the conditions of approval the Guideline is met.**

**11. Landscape Buffering and Screening**

*A. A landscape buffer should provide landscape screening, and horizontal separation between different zoning districts and between non-residential land uses and residential land uses. The buffer should not be applicable along property lines where existing natural features such as flood plains, wetlands, riparian zones and identified significant groves already provide a high degree of visual screening. (Standard 60.05.25.13)*

The applicant states a 20 foot buffer has been designed where the proposal abuts residential uses along the eastern property line. The buffer has been designed to meet the city's B-3 buffer standard, which would be the city's desired buffer in cases of a Conditional Use abutting residential uses. The buffer consists of an existing six foot tall fence, with trees, shrubs and groundcover in accordance with the B-3 buffer standard. Additional tree plantings are proposed. Staff concurs that the buffering provided is adequate to screen the proposed development from adjacent residential uses.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

*B. When potential impacts of a Conditional Use are determined, or when potential conflicts of use exist between adjacent zoning districts, such as industrial uses abutting residential uses, landscape screening should be dense, and the buffer width maximized. When potential conflicts of uses are not as great, such as a commercial use abutting an industrial use, less dense landscape screening and narrower buffer width is appropriate. (Standard 60.05.25.13)*

The proposed project requires a Conditional Use. As noted above in Section A of this Guideline, the applicant is proposing a 20 foot wide B-3 buffer, consistent with the city's Design Standard along areas of residential development.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

*C. Landscape buffering should consist of a variety of trees, shrubs, and ground covers designed to screen potential conflict areas and complement the overall visual character of the development and adjacent neighborhoods. (Standard 60.05.25.13)*

The applicant states that the proposed landscape plantings will consist of a variety of trees, shrubs and groundcover designed to provide an effective visual screen along residential areas. Landscape materials have been chosen to complement existing trees and vegetation on site. Staff concurs that the schedule of planting materials shown on Sheet L105 and L106 in Exhibit 1 of the applicant's materials provide ample variety and screening.



**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

*D. When changes to buffer widths and buffer standards are proposed, the applicant should describe the physical site constraints or unique building or site characteristics that merit width reduction. (Standard 60.05.25.13.E).*

Landscape buffers along the eastern property line remain 20 feet wide across the entire shared property line.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

**60.05.50. Lighting Design Guidelines.** *Unless otherwise noted, all guidelines apply in all zoning districts. (Standard 60.05.30.1 and 2)*

1. *Lighting should be utilized to maximize safety within a development through strategic placement of pole-mounted, non-pole mounted and bollard luminaries.*

The applicant states that lighting is designed to provide safe access of all vehicular routes and parking areas to the lighted field and sport court. Additionally, the shared access drive, to be permitted and constructed with the William Walker Elementary School project, will be lit.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

2. *Pedestrian scale lighting should be an integral part of the design concept except for industrial projects. Poles and fixtures for pole-mounted lighting should be of a consistent type throughout the project. The design of wall-mounted lighting should be appropriate to the architectural design features of the building.*

The applicant states that fixtures will be consistent throughout the project, and will match the fixtures on the abutting reconstructed William Walker Elementary School.

**Therefore, staff find that by meeting the conditions of approval the Guideline is met.**

3. *Lighting should minimize direct and indirect glare impacts to abutting and adjacent properties and streets by incorporating lens-shields, shades or other measures to screen the view of light sources from residences and streets.*

The applicant states that the lit sports fields and courts are located at the northern end of the site to limit impacts to abutting residential properties. Shielded and angled light fixtures will be utilized to screen view of lights from residences and streets.

**Therefore, staff find the Guideline is met.**

4. *On-site lighting should comply with the City's Technical Lighting Standards. Where the proposal does not comply with the Technical Lighting Standards, the applicant should describe the unique circumstances attributed to the use or site where compliance with the standard is either infeasible or unnecessary.*

The applicant provides a photometric plan which complies with the maximum property lighting of 0.5 footcandles at the property line except for the shared property line with William Walker Elementary School, and along the northern edge of the site abutting the racquetball club. Both BSD and THPRD have stated that they have consistent lighting schedules, and do not intend to light their properties after 10:30 pm. Therefore, the minimal light trespass as shown is not expected to have any negative impacts on the abutting park property. Light trespass across the northern property line is limited to the sport court and athletic field lighting. Section 60.50-1.F of the Development Code exempts public outdoor recreation uses from the maximum permitted illumination at the property line. Existing evergreen landscaping on the racquetball property currently provide sufficient screening of the racquetball club parking lot.

The lighting plan does not meet the minimum lighting of 1.0 footcandles for the vehicle and drive aisles and pedestrian pathways of the site. However, the applicant states that outside of programmed events on the athletic fields, parks under their ownership and maintenance are not lit. As the programmed athletic fields are lit until 10:30 pm, staff believes it is reasonable that, at minimum, all pathways connecting parking lots to the programmed athletic fields should be lit to the 1.0 footcandle standard, to accommodate safe egress at the conclusion of programmed events. Staff recommend a condition of approval that a revised lighting plan be submitted at the time of Site Development permit review, demonstrating that all vehicle maneuvering areas, as well as all pathways connecting the programmed athletic field and parking lots, be in compliance with the Technical Lighting Standards of the Development Code.

**Therefore, staff find that by meeting the conditions of approval the Guideline is met.**

### **Recommendation**

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommend **APPROVAL** of **DR2017-0002 (Cedar Hills park Redevelopment)**, subject to the applicable conditions identified in Attachment E

**TP2017-0001  
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS FOR  
TREE PLAN TWO**

**Section 40.90.05 Tree Plan Applications; Purpose**

*Healthy trees and urban forest provide a variety of natural resource and community benefits for the City of Beaverton. Primary among those benefits is the aesthetic contribution to the increasingly urban landscape. Tree resource protection focuses on the aesthetic benefits of the resource. The purpose of a Tree Plan application is to provide a mechanism to regulate pruning, removal, replacement, and mitigation for removal of Protected Trees (Significant Individual Trees, Historic Trees, trees within Significant Groves and Significant Natural Resource Areas (SNRAs)), and Community Trees, thus helping to preserve and enhance the sustainability of the City's urban forest.*

**Section 40.90.15.2.C Approval Criteria**

*In order to approve a Tree Plan Two application, the decision making authority shall make findings of fact based on evidence provided by the applicant demonstrating that all the following criteria are satisfied:*

***1. The proposal satisfies the threshold requirements for a Tree Plan Two application.***

The applicant proposes to remove or impact root zones of 54 trees from Significant Grove 37 through the construction park amenities, including a multiuse field, bocce ball court, asphalt path, group shelter, and picnic tables. Under a separate but concurrently reviewed land use application, Beaverton School District is proposing to remove or impact root zones of 77 trees from Significant Grove 37 through the construction a shared access drive and frontage improvements to Cedar Hills Boulevard. Jointly, these two projects proposed to remove 45.7% of the non-exempt total DBH of Significant Grove 37. Therefore, the subject proposal alone requests to remove less than 75% of the total DBH of Significant Grove 37 on site, which meets threshold three for a Tree Plan Two application.

- 3. Commercial, Residential, or Industrial zoning district: Removal of up to and including 75% of the total DBH of non-exempt surveyed tree(s) found on the project site within SNRAs, Significant Groves, or Sensitive Areas as defined by Clean Water Services.***

**Therefore, staff find that the proposal meets this criterion for approval.**

***2. All City application fees related to the application under consideration by the decision making authority have been submitted.***

The applicant has paid the required fee for a Tree Plan Two application.

**Therefore, staff find that the proposal meets this criterion for approval.**

**3. *If applicable, removal of any tree is necessary to observe good forestry practices according to recognized American National Standards Institute (ANSI) A300-1995 standards and International Society of Arborists (ISA) standards on the subject.***

The trees are not proposed for removal to observe good forestry practices. The trees are proposed for removal to accommodate the development of the site including the associated grading and construction.

**Therefore, staff find that this criterion for approval does not apply.**

**4. *If applicable, removal of any tree is necessary to accommodate physical development where no reasonable alternative exists.***

The applicant states that The Cedar Hills Park project will result in tree removal and critical root zone impact within Grove 37 due to construction of the artificial turf sports field, sand volleyball courts, bocce courts, ADA accessible picnic tables, a group shelter, and paved paths. The William Walker Elementary School project will result in tree removal and critical root zone impact within Grove 37 due to the widening of Cedar Hills Blvd., construction of the shared access drive including sidewalks, and relocation of public water and sanitary sewer utilities under the shared access drive.

**Artificial Turf Sports Field**

The applicant is proposing a new lighted sports field, 360 feet by 360 feet in size, to accommodate multi-purpose sporting facilities. The sports fields are proposed to meet the anticipated sports fields demand in the community. The applicant states that this is a reduced size field from the original design, accommodating 1.5 soccer field and a baseball field, as opposed the original 2 soccer fields and a baseball field. The reduction in field size was done in an effort to reduce impacts to the Significant Grove. This field has been located on the north east portion of the park, partly to accommodate at the shared access drive, and partly to limit Significant Grove impacts. Impacts to the Significant Grove by the field and adjacent pathways serving the field, by staff assessment, include removal of 11 trees and impacts to the root zone of 11 trees.

Based on the size and location and project community demand of the sports fields, staff concurs that there is no reasonable alternative.

**Sand Volleyball Courts**

Three sand volleyball courts are proposed to be located on the western edge of the site, just along the south edge of the Significant Grove. Two courts exist currently in the park, but will be relocated to accommodate the turf sports field. The courts are located in a difficult to program corner of the site, and is an efficient use of the park space. These courts will necessitate the removal of one Significant Grove tree, and will impact the root zones of two larger Significant Grove trees. These trees are on the outer edge of the Significant Grove.

Based on the location, efficient use of land, and minimal impact to the Significant Grove, staff concurs that there is no reasonable alternative.

### Bocce Courts

Three bocce courts, as well as pathways framing the courts, are located entirely within Significant Grove. The applicant states that during the master planning process, there was strong support to retain and expand the existing bocce courts on site. The public's preference, as well as the Board of Directors preference was to expand the bocce courts to four courts to accommodate tournament play. However, the applicant's plans show three courts, in an effort to reduce impacts to the Significant Grove.

Staff is concerned that locating this amenity entirely within the Significant Grove is not the only reasonable alternative. A possible alternative location exists in the southern portion of the site, east of the splash pad and 2-5 year old play area, where open lawn area is preserved.

The applicant states that setting, context and functionality, ADA Accessibility, Significant Grove impacts, number of courts, and materials were considered when selecting the bocce site.

- Setting -- The applicant states that bocce is a low intensity form of recreation that lends itself to quieter, more intimate public spaces. Staff notes that the proposed location of the bocce courts would be one of the quieter, calmer spaces in the park.

The applicant further states that some park elements require stronger connections, including the splash pad and adjacent lawn area. Staff acknowledges likely desire for lawn areas with sun exposure adjacent to the splash pad for users and their families. However, it is staff's opinion that, simply put, this design decision places open lawn area as a higher priority than the Significant Grove.

- Context and Functionality – The applicant states that the bocce courts should be located in areas intended for social gatherings and passive recreation, such as picnic tables and group shelters. These amenities are also proposed within the Significant Grove, and are discussed further below. Staff agrees that these passive elements will likely work better when located together. Furthermore, the applicant notes that an LGGP grant was awarded from ORDP for the group shelter, which was leveraged in part by the promise to building bocce courts and complete ADA access. However, the applicant has not established a need for these items to be located in the Significant Grove
- ADA Accessibility – The applicant states that Bocce is a highly inclusive form of recreation if designed properly, and the new courts will be designed to meet ADA compliance and be located in a centralized accessible area within the park, convenient to parking and other compatible amenities. Staff is fully supportive of inclusive and accessible recreation. However, the applicant has not demonstrated that alternative locations cannot be reasonably made ADA accessible. Staff further notes that the proposed location is not particularly close to parking lots, and the closer parking lot requires crossing the shared access drive to reach the courts.
- Significant Grove Impacts – The applicant states only two spruce trees and two fir trees must be removed with the bocce court development. Staff identifies a further seven trees that appear to have root zone impacts from the bocce court and pathways framing the courts. Staff acknowledges that the courts have been located in a manner that impacts a relatively small number of trees, when compared to other possible locations within the Significant Grove. The applicant states that THPRD has had great success in limiting root zone impacts during construction, citing Lowami Hart Woods Park, a trail project in which

a majority of the root impact trees were not directly removed as part of the construction of the trail. Staff acknowledges past successes, and cites recommendations provided in the Arborist Report (Exhibit G). Staff recommends a condition of approval adopting the arborist recommendations regarding “Tree Protection Fencing During Construction” for any work within the Significant Tree Grove.

- Number of Courts – The applicant has noted that the public’s preference for court number is four, to accommodate tournament play. However, to minimize tree impacts, three courts have been proposed. Staff is concerned that the desired amenity is be constructed in a manner that does not meet the desires of the public, in a location that is discouraged by the city’s Development Code. Staff has not seen any evidence demonstrating that a full size, 4 court bocce amenity could not be located in an area less impactful to the Significant Grove.
- Materials – The applicant states that the court surface is anticipated to be synthetic turf surfacing (similar to artificial putting greens) with an under-drainage system and perimeter curbing, consistent with the district’s current standards. This will allow a firm and durable all-weather maintainable surface. Staff appreciates and acknowledges the design to ensure low maintenance and readily accessible recreation amenities, but does not believe this feature justifies location within the Significant Grove.

For the reasons discussed above, staff believes that the applicants have not demonstrated the location of bocce ball courts as proposed are the only reasonable location within the park. As such, staff recommends a condition of approval that the applicant relocate the bocce court outside of the Significant Grove or remove the bocce court entirely.

#### ADA accessible picnic tables, Group Shelter, and Paved Paths

The applicant states that the Significant Grove currently functions as a unique passive recreation amenity. However, in its current condition, it is not ADA accessible and thereby excludes a certain population within the community from experiencing and enjoying it. So, at a bare minimum, there is a need to provide proposed upgrades and enhancements including making 50% of the picnic tables ADA compliant and accessible and constructing accessible pathways to allow all to experience the grove. Providing ADA accessible picnic tables elsewhere in the park in lieu of tables within the grove does not meet the intent of the ADA standards. In order to bring the passive recreation up to ADA compliance, the proposed design has incorporated a loop pathway that not only provides access to ADA compliant amenities, but also allows all patrons the opportunity to experience the grove itself.

Staff acknowledges the need to comply with the American’s with Disabilities Act and the desire to provide equal and accessible recreation opportunities for all community members. Staff further acknowledges the logic in locating the group shelter adjacent to ADA accessible picnic tables. However, as discussed above, the applicant has not provided any specific methods of construction proposed to minimize root impacts to Significant Grove trees, nor has any evidence been submitted that the Significant Grove is the only reasonable location for ADA accessible picnic tables and group shelter.

For the reasons discussed above, staff believes that the applicants have not demonstrated the location of ADA accessible picnic tables, Group Shelter, and Paved Paths courts as proposed are

the only reasonable location within the park. As such, staff recommends a condition of approval that the applicant relocate these amenities outside of the Significant Grove.

However, as the applicants plan show that these amenities will not require the removal of any Significant Grove trees, and will only cause root zone impacts, the applicants findings are strengthened by the low impact construction methods recommended in the Arborist report (Exhibit G of the applicant's materials) These detailed arborist recommended construction methods could be adopted as Conditions of Approval to ensure the lowest possible impacts to root zones of Significant Grove Trees. Staff recommends an additional condition of approval that the arborist recommended construction methods referenced above be adopted as additional conditions of approval to minimize impacts to root zones of trees shown to be impacted but not necessarily removed.

**Therefore, by meeting the conditions of approval, staff find that the proposal meets this criterion for approval.**

**5. *If applicable, removal of any tree is necessary because it has become a nuisance by virtue of damage to property or improvements, either public or private, on the subject site or adjacent sites.***

Property damage or other nuisances are not the reason the trees are being removed. Trees are being removed to facilitate development of the site.

**Therefore, staff find that this criterion for approval does not apply.**

**6. *If applicable, removal is necessary to accomplish public purposes, such as installation of public utilities, street widening, and similar needs, where no reasonable alternative exists without significantly increasing public costs or reducing safety.***

No public utilities, street widening, or other similar infrastructure improvements are proposed with this project that is expected to impact the Significant Grove. Construction of a shared access drive and frontage improvements along SW Cedar Hills Boulevard are being reviewed and permitted under a separate land use application for the redevelopment of William Walker Elementary School.

**Therefore, staff find that the proposal meets this criterion for approval.**

**7. *If applicable, removal of any tree is necessary to enhance the health of the tree, grove, SNRA, or adjacent trees, [or] to eliminate conflicts with structures or vehicles.***

The removal of trees is not necessary to enhance the Significant Grove on-site or eliminate conflicts with structures or vehicles.

**Therefore, staff find that this criterion for approval does not apply.**

**8. If applicable, removal of a tree(s) within a SNRA or Significant Grove will not result in a reversal of the original determination that the SNRA or Significant Grove is significant based on criteria used in making the original significance determination.**

The applicant cites the City's Development Code Definition for Significant Tree Grove Inventory Analysis:

*a) The grove is relatively mature and evenly aged; and*

The grove is composed primarily of mature Douglas Fir trees (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) of varying sizes and includes 218 trees. The grove is devoid of natural understory and the area is primarily used for picnicking and other passive recreation by park users. Soil compaction is apparent due to the mowing and other maintenance vehicle activity to service the site. Tree sizes in the grove range from approximately 4 inches to 48 inches DBH. The Tree Plan shows 92 remaining trees that will range in size from 4 inches to 48 inches DBH, thus maintaining a mature and evenly aged grove.

*b) The grove has a purity of species composition or is of a rare or unusual nature; and*

The grove is primarily composed of native Douglas Fir and contains other native conifer and deciduous species (see tree tables in Exhibit 7 for specific species information). The grove is rare due to the average age/size of the trees within it and because of its location in a very urbanized portion of the City that does not contain large groves of mature trees. Most the trees that are proposed to be preserved are mature Douglas Firs and the resulting number of trees preserved will still constitute a large grove of mature, native trees in the context of the surrounding urban area.

*c) The grove has a purity of species composition or is of a rare or unusual nature; or*

Based on the project tree inventory, most of the trees in the grove are in a good or fair condition (i.e., 91 good condition and 66 fair condition). Careful attention has been made to assess potential direct and indirect effects on tree health from the proposed actions in the grove. There are 68 trees that do not occur within the physical footprint of the proposed improvements, but could be harmed by root zone encroachment will be assessed individually for possible retention. However, these trees have been included in the total tree removal count for the purposes of this tree plan. It is expected that preserved trees will not be harmed by proposed construction activities and future use of the improvements located in the grove will not hamper the health of the resultant grove.

*d) The grove has a purity of species composition or is of a rare or unusual nature.*

The grove provides an important functional and aesthetic quality for the park and surrounding area. Functionally, the grove provides a forested, open area for park goers to use. It also enhances the park's open space quality by providing a natural and aesthetically-pleasing area in an otherwise developed park and developed surrounding area. The grove is not expected to lose its functional or aesthetic value because of the proposed park improvements.

Staff concurs with the applicant's analysis that the proposed shared access drive will not result in a reversal of the original Significant Grove determination.



**Therefore, staff find that the proposal meets this criterion for approval.**

**9. *If applicable, removal of a tree(s) within a SNRA or Significant Grove will not result in the remaining trees posing a safety hazard due to the effects of windthrow.***

The applicant states that most the trees proposed to be removed in the significant grove occur within the new access drive alignment that will provide access to Cedar Hills Park and the William Walker Elementary School site. The drive is generally aligned in a north/south orientation. Few trees along the existing edge of the grove will be removed. Therefore, most of the trees within the grove that are expected to have the greatest root strength and resistance to windthrow will be preserved. THPRD will inspect preserved trees for signs of potential windthrow susceptibility or damage after project implementation and will conduct tree pruning or removal as necessary, consistent with the City's Development Code, to maintain save conditions in the grove. Staff concurs with the applicant's analysis that the remaining Significant Grove will not be at an increased risk of windthrow.

**Therefore, staff find that the proposal meets this criterion for approval.**

**10. *The proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Section 60.60 Trees and Vegetation and Section 60.67 Significant Natural Resources.***

Staff cites the applicable Development Code sections in the Development Code Conformance Analysis chart at the end of the Tree Plan Staff Report, which evaluates the project as it relates to applicable code requirements of Sections 60.60 through 60.67, as applicable to the aforementioned criterion. As demonstrated on the chart, the proposal complies with all applicable provisions of Chapter 60.60 and 60.67.

**Therefore, staff find by meeting the Conditions of Approval, the proposal meets the criterion for approval.**

**11. *Grading and contouring of the site is designed to accommodate the proposed use and to mitigate adverse effect(s) on neighboring properties, public right-of-way, surface drainage, water storage facilities, and the public storm drainage system.***

This approval criterion is identical to Facilities Review approval criterion J. The response contained within the Facilities Review report (Attachment A, above) is hereby cited and incorporated. The applicant's plans demonstrate a balance of accommodating the proposed use while minimizing the adverse effects on neighboring properties.

**Therefore, staff find that the proposal meets this criterion for approval.**

**12. *The proposal contains all applicable application submittal requirements as specified in Section 50.25.1 of the Development Code.***

The applicant submitted the application on January 12, 2017 and was deemed complete on May

17, 2017. In the review of the materials during the application review, staff finds that all applicable application submittal requirements, identified in Section 50.25.1 are contained within this proposal.

**Therefore, staff finds that the proposal meets this criterion for approval.**

**13. *Applications and documents related to the request, which will require further City approval, shall be submitted to the City in the proper sequence.***

The applicant has submitted all documents related to this request for Tree Plan Type Two approval. New Conditional Use and Design Review Three applications are being processed concurrently with the subject request for Tree Plan Two approval. No additional applications or documents are needed at this time.

**Therefore, staff finds that the proposal meets this criterion for approval.**

**Recommendation**

Based on the facts and findings presented, staff recommend **APPROVAL** of **TP2017-0001 (Cedar Hills Park Redevelopment)** subject to the applicable conditions identified in Attachment E.

**Code Conformance Analysis**  
**Chapter 60.60 Trees and Vegetation & Chapter 60.67 Significant Natural Resources**

<b>CODE SECTION</b>	<b>CODE REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>PROJECT PROPOSAL</b>	<b>MEET STANDARD</b>
<b>60.60.15 Pruning, Removal, and Preservation Standards</b>			
60.60.15.1A-B	Pruning Standards	The project identifies the root zones of several Significant Grove trees to be impacted. The applicant states that root impacts will be done in accordance with standards of this code section in efforts to preserve trees that sustain root impacts.	<b>YES</b>
60.60.15.2.A	Removal of Protected Trees must be in accordance with this section.	The proposed tree removal complies with this section (see findings below).	<b>YES w/COA</b>
60.60.15.2.B	Removal of Landscape Trees and Significant Trees shall be required as set forth in 60.60.25	The proposed significant tree removal complies with this section (see findings below).	<b>YES</b>
60.60.15.2.C.1	Standards for SNRA & Significant Groves – Minimum Preservation	Minimum 25% of significant grove on site must be preserved; BSD and THPRD projects combine propose to preserve approximately 54% of significant grove on site.	<b>YES</b>
60.60.15.2.C.2	Standards for SNRA & Significant Groves – Cohesive Areas	Preserved significant grove located in single two cohesive areas, one on either side of the shared access drive.	<b>YES</b>
60.60.15.2.C.3	Standards for SNRA & Significant Groves – Native Understory	Tree protection fencing will limit construction vehicle access in the significant grove.	<b>YES w/COA</b>
60.60.15.2.C.4-5	Standards for SNRA & Significant Groves – Preservation with DR Proposal	<p>Application is part of a Design Review proposal. Therefore, the remainder of the Significant Grove should be located in a preservation easement.</p> <p>However, given the amenities proposed within the significant grove, a standard conservation easement would be impractical.</p> <p>Following construction of improvements permitted</p>	<b>YES w/ COA</b>

		<p>under this project and the separate land use applications permitting the shared access path, the Significant Grove will be functionally split into two grove segments, east and west of the shared access drive</p> <p>Staff is recommending a condition of approval that the applicant, following all improvements constructed by the aforementioned projects, shall record a conservation and maintenance easement for each Grove segment. The easement shall have language that permits maintenance and replacement of all amenities within the easements, but additional expansion of amenities is prohibited.</p> <p>This easement language shall be reviewed by the City Attorney before recording.</p>	
60.60.15.2.C.6	Standards for SNRA & Significant Groves – Preservation with LD Proposal	No Land Division is proposed.	<b>N/A</b>
60.60.15.2.C.7	Standards for SNRA & Significant Groves – Native vs. Non-Native	Applicant has designed project to prioritize native significant trees where possible preserve native trees	<b>YES</b>
60.60.15.2.C.8	Standards for SNRA & Significant Groves	As analyzed in Section 60.60.15.2.C.4-5, a maintenance and conservation easement will be required following park and shared access drive.	<b>YES</b>

<b>60.60.20 Tree Protection Standards During Development</b>			
60.60.20.1	Trees shall be protected during construction by a 4' orange plastic fence and activity within the protected root zone shall be limited. Other protections measures may be used with City approval.	Tree fencing will be constructed consistent city requirement for trees identified for preservation. Staff recommends a condition of approval requiring that a certified arborist be on-site for any site work within root zones of any preserved significant grove trees.	<b>YES w/ COA</b>
<b>60.60.25 Mitigation Requirements</b>			
60.60.25.1.A-F	Standards for removal of Significant Trees	Staff recommends a condition of approval that the applicant adhere to Section 60.60.20 unless modified in agreement with the City Arborist.	<b>YES w/ COA</b>
60.60.25.2	Mitigation Standards for removal of Significant Trees.	The proposal includes removal of less than 50 percent of the DBH of Trees within Significant Grove No. 37. Therefore, no mitigation is required.	<b>YES</b>
60.60.25.9	Landscape Tree Mitigation	No landscape trees are located on-site	<b>N/A</b>
<b>60.67 Significant Natural Resources</b>			
60.67.05.1	Development activities in locations of possible significant natural resources and/or wetlands are subject to relevant procedures identified in Chapter 50.	No significant natural resources exist on site.	<b>N/A</b>
60.67.05.2	For sites identified in the Local Wetland Inventory notice of the proposed development shall be provided to DSL.	No significant natural resources exist on site.	<b>N/A</b>
60.67.10	Development activities in locations of Significant Riparian Corridors are subject to relevant procedures identified in Chapter 50.	No significant natural resources exist on site.	<b>N/A</b>

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

### A. Prior to site development permit issuance, the applicant shall:

1. Submit the required plans, application form, fee, and other items needed for a complete site development permit application per the applicable review checklist. (Site Development Div./JJD)
2. Contract with a professional engineer to design and monitor the construction for any work governed by Beaverton Municipal Code 9.05.020, as set forth in Ordinance 4417 (City Engineering Design Manual and Standard Drawings), Beaverton Development Code (Ordinance 2050, 4010 +rev.), the Clean Water Services District Design and Construction Standards (June 2007, Resolution and Ordinance 2017-05), and the City Standard Agreement to Construct and Retain Design Professionals in Oregon. (Site Development Div./JJD)
3. Submit a completed and executed City Standard Agreement to Construct Improvements and Retain Design Professional(s) Registered in Oregon. After the site development permit is issued, the City Engineer and the Planning Director must approve all revisions as set out in Ordinances 2050, 4010+rev., and 4417; however, any required land use action shall be final prior to City staff approval of the engineering plan revision and work commencing as revised. (Site Development Div./JJD)
4. Have the ownership of the subject property guarantee all public improvements, site grading, storm water management (quality and quantity) facilities, private streets, and common driveway/emergency access paving by submittal of a City-approved security. The security approval by the City consists of a review by the City Attorney for form and the City Engineer for amount, equivalent to 100 percent or more of estimated construction costs. (Site Development Div./JJD)
5. Submit all required off-site easements, quit claim deeds, and on-site easements (including a minimum 15-foot-wide public pedestrian and bicycle easement establishing an open, continuous corridor from SW Cedar Hills Boulevard to SW Lynnfield Lane) executed and ready for recording, to the City after approval by the City Engineer for legal description of the area encumbered and City Attorney as to form. (Site Development Div./JJD)
6. Submit to the City a copy of issued permits or other approvals needed from Washington County for work within, and/or construction access to all the affected County road right of ways. (Site Development Div./JJD)
7. Have obtained the Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue District Fire Marshal's approval of the site development plans as part of the City's plan review process. (Site Development Div./JJD)
8. Submit a detailed water demand analysis (fire flow calculations) in accordance with the requirements of the Fire Code as adopted by the Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue. If determined to be needed by the City Building Official and Fire Marshal, this analysis shall be supplemented by an actual flow test and evaluation by a professional engineer (meeting the standards set by the City Engineer as specified in the

Engineering Design Manual Chapter 6, 610.L). The analysis shall provide the available water volume (GPM) at 20 psi residual pressure from the fire hydrant nearest to the proposed project. (Site Development Div./JJD)

9. Submit a copy of issued permits or other approvals needed from the Tualatin Valley Water District for public water system construction, backflow prevention facilities, and service extensions. (Site Development Div./JJD)
10. Submit a copy of issued permits or other approvals needed from the Clean Water Services District for storm system connections, and any construction directly affecting an Agency sanitary-sewer main. (Site Development Div./JJD)
11. Submit a completed 1200-C Permit (DEQ/CWS/City Erosion Control Joint Permit) application to the City. The applicant shall use the standard plan format per requirements for sites 5 acres or larger adopted by DEQ and Clean Water Services. (Site Development Div./JJD)
12. Provide final construction plans and a final drainage report, as generally outlined in the submitted preliminary drainage report, demonstrating compliance with City storm detention requirements (per Section 330, of City Ordinance 4417) and with CWS Resolution and Order 2017-05 in regard to water quality treatment. (Site Development Div./JJD)
13. Provide a detailed drainage analysis of the subject site and prepare a final report prepared by a professional engineer meeting the standards set by the City Engineer. The analysis shall identify all contributing drainage areas and plumbing systems on and adjacent to the site with the site development permit application. The analysis shall also delineate all areas on the site that are inundated during a 100-year storm event, including the safe overflow conveyance from proposed constructed stormwater management facilities. On all plan sheets that show grading and elevations, the 100 year inundation level shall be identified. (Site Development Div./JJD)
14. Provide construction plans that show how each lot will be independently served by utility systems as required by the City Engineer and City Building Official per City standards. All site sewer (storm and sanitary) plumbing that serves more than one lot, or crosses onto another lot, shall be considered a public system and shall be constructed to the requirements of the City Engineer. Sheet flow of surface water from one lot's paved area to another lot's paved area shall not be considered a direct plumbing service. (Site Development Div./JJD)
15. Submit to the City a certified impervious surface determination of the proposed project's net new impervious area proposed for any common areas and private streets prepared by the applicant's engineer, architect, or surveyor. The certification shall consist of an analysis and calculations determining the square footage of all impervious surfaces as a total for the common areas and private streets. In addition, specific types of impervious area totals, in square feet, shall be given for parking lots and driveways, sidewalk and pedestrian areas, and any gravel surfaces. Calculations shall also indicate the square footage of pre-existing impervious surface, the new impervious surface area created, and total final impervious surface area on the entire site. (Site Development Div./JJD)
16. Pay a storm water system development charge (overall system conveyance) for any net new impervious area proposed for any phase. Additionally, the project shall pay a storm water quality (summer treatment) in-lieu of fee for any impervious area

determined by the City Engineer not to practical to provide treatment in any single phase per Clean Water Services standards. (Site Development Div./JJD)

17. Submit an owner-executed, notarized, City/CWS standard private stormwater facilities maintenance agreement for the private storm water treatment facilities, with maintenance plan and all standard exhibits, including site legal description, ready for recording with Washington County Records. (Site Development Div./JJD)
18. Provide plans for street lights (Option C unless otherwise approved by the City Public Works Director) and for the placement of underground utility lines along street frontages, within the site, and for services to the proposed new development. No overhead services shall remain on the site. If existing utility poles along existing street frontages must be moved to accommodate the proposed improvements, the affected lines must be either undergrounded or a fee in lieu of undergrounding paid per Section 60.65 of the Development Code. (Site Development Div./JJD)
19. Submit plans that show access for a maintenance vehicle within 6-feet from the front, or within 15-feet from the side of a vehicle to all control structures unless otherwise specifically approved by the City Engineer. A direct worker access route to the structures in the pond area shall be provided no steeper than 4(horizontal) to 1 (vertical) slope. This direct route shall be a minimum of 6-feet wide and have a surface consisting of the equivalent of 3-inches of  $\frac{3}{4}$ "-minus crush rock (to allow walking access in winter) and vegetation shall allow easy access. This direct access route shall be delineated on the plans. (Site Development Div./JJD)
20. Provide plans showing a standard commercial, Portland-Cement Concrete driveway apron at the intersection of any private, common driveway and a public street. (Site Development Div./JJD)
21. The following shall be recorded with Washington County (Contact Scott Young – 503.846.7933):
  - a) Dedication of additional right-of-way to provide a minimum of 55 feet from the centerline of SW Cedar Hills Boulevard, including adequate corner radius at the intersection with SW Huntington Avenue.
  - b) Dedication of additional right-of-way to provide a minimum of 51 feet from the centerline of SW Cedar Hills Boulevard.
  - c) Provision of a non-access reservation along SW Cedar Hills Road frontage and SW Walker Road, except at the access approved in conjunction with this land use application.
  - d) Additional right-of-way to construct the traffic signal at the park's access on SW Cedar Hills Boulevard as required by County Engineering Services as part of design review. (WaCo/NV)
22. Submit to Washington County Public Assurance Staff, 503-846-3843:
  - a) Completed "Design Option" form.
  - b) \$5,000.00 Administration Deposit.

NOTE: The Administration Deposit is a cost-recovery account used to pay for County services provided to the developer, including plan review and approval, field inspections, as-built approval, Page 4 of 5 and project administration. The Administration Deposit amount noted above is an estimate of what it will cost to provide these services. If, during the course



of the project, the Administration Deposit account is running low, additional funds will be requested to cover the estimated time left on the project (at then-current rates per the adopted Washington County Fee Schedule). If there are any unspent funds at project close out, they will be refunded to the applicant. Any point of contact with County staff can be a chargeable cost. If project plans are not complete or do not comply with County standards and codes, costs will be higher. There is a charge to cover the cost of every field inspection. Costs for enforcement actions will also be charged to the applicant.

- c) A copy of the City's Notice of Decision with Conditions and the County's letter dated June 29, 2017.
- d) Three (3) sets of complete engineering plans for construction of the following public improvements, including construction access and circulation plan:
  - 1. Pedestrian crossing and ramps on the east side of SW 123rd Avenue to SW Walker Road to County standards. Provide illumination to County standards.
  - 2. All work proposed within the right-of-way of SW Walker Road and SW Cedar Hills Boulevard shall be designed and constructed to County standards.
  - 3. Construction of a six (6) foot concrete sidewalk on SW Walker Road, including roadside drainage to County standards (refer to proposal dated 6-12-17 from MacKay Sposito for the limits of the sidewalk). All work proposed within the right-of-way of SW Walker Road and SW Cedar Hills Boulevard shall be designed and constructed to County standards.

(WaCo/NV)

23. Obtain a Washington County Facility Permit upon completion of the following:

- a) Obtain Engineering Division approval and provide a financial assurance for the construction of the public improvements listed in conditions 22.D

NOTE: The Public Assurance staff (503-846-3843) will send the required forms to the applicant's representative after submittal and approval of items listed under condition 22.

The Facility Permit allows construction work within County rights-of-way and permits site access only after the developer first submits plans and obtains Washington County Engineering approval, obtains required grading and erosion control permits, and satisfies various other requirements of Washington County's Assurances Section including but not limited to execution of financial and contractual agreements. This process ensures that the developer accepts responsibility for construction of public improvements, and that improvements are closely monitored, inspected, and built to standard in a timely manner. Access will only be permitted under the required Washington County Facility Permit, and only following submittal and County acceptance of all materials required under the facility permit process. (WaCo/NV)

- 24. Submit plans that show the construction of a sidewalk that is a minimum of 6 feet wide along the park's SW Walker Rd. frontage, as directed by Washington County Transportation and Engineering staff. (Transportation/KR)
- 25. Submit plans that show adequate signage for the proposed configuration of the multi-use pedestrian and bicycle pathway on the northern portion of the site, to the satisfaction of the City Traffic Engineer. (Transportation/KR)
- 26. Submit plans that show that the parking spaces that face SW Cedar Hills Blvd. will be adequately screened for headlight glare by either an evergreen hedge or a low fence

or wall, to meet the standards of Section 60.05.20.4 of the Development Code.  
(Transportation/KR)

27. Submit plans that include details of the proposed bicycle parking spaces. Racks are to be at least 30 inches wide by 36 inches tall, centered within an area that is 6 feet by four feet, and at least 2 feet from any building. Inverter U-type or staple racks are the preferred option for bicycle parking. (Transportation/KR)
28. Submit a revised lighting plan, demonstrating that all vehicle maneuvering areas, as well as all pathways connecting the programmed athletic field and parking lots, be in compliance with the Technical Lighting Standards of the Development Code.  
(Planning/SR)
29. Submit plans showing the bocce court, loop path, and group shelter removed from the significant grove. (Planning/SR)
30. Provide plans showing all preserved significant grove trees located inside tree protection easements. (Planning/SR)
31. Submit plans showing temporary tree fencing for all on-site trees to be preserved, and all off-site trees on or near the property line of the subject site. (Planning/SR)
32. Ensure that all associated applications have been approved and are consistent with the submitted plans, except where modified by these conditions. (Planning/SR)
33. Submit plans demonstrating that all retaining walls longer than 50 feet in length of taller than six feet be treated and finished with a contrasting scoring, textured, and/or color pattern.

**B. Prior to any building permit issuance, the applicant shall:**

34. Submit a complete site development permit application and obtain the issuance of site development permit from the Site Development Division. (Site Development Div./JJD)
35. Make provisions for installation of all mandated erosion control measures to achieve City inspector approval at least 24 hours prior to call for foundation footing form inspection from the Building Division. (Site Development Div./JJD)
36. Provide proof of recording the necessary documents associated with the project, including any necessary easement quit claim deeds and a filed survey consistent with the approved site plan. (Site Development Div./JJD)
37. Provide photometric plans that show that all pedestrian walkways are lit to at least the minimum 0.5 foot-candle standard of the Engineering Design Manual.  
(Transportation/KR)

**C. Prior to occupancy permit issuance, the applicant shall:**

38. Have substantially completed the site development improvements as determined by the City Engineer. (Site Development Div./JJD)
39. Have the landscaping completely installed or provide for erosion control measures around any disturbed or exposed areas per Clean Water Services standards. (Site Development Div./JJD)

40. Have placed underground all affected, applicable existing overhead utilities and any new utility service lines within the project and along any existing street frontage as determined at permit issuance. (Site Development Div./JJD)
41. Install or replace, to City specifications, all sidewalks which are missing, damaged, deteriorated, or removed by construction. (Site Development Div./JJD)
42. Have obtained a Source Control Sewage Permit from the Clean Water Services District (CWS) and submitted a copy to the City Building Official if a Source Control Sewage permit is required, as determined by CWS. (Site Development Div./JJD)

**D. Prior to final inspection of any building permit, the applicant shall:**

43. Install the proposed bicycle parking and provide adequate lighting to meet the 0.5 average foot-candle standard of the Engineering Design Manual. (Transportation/KR)
44. Install a low wall or vegetated hedge along all parking spaces that abut and face the public right-of-way, in accordance with Section 60.05.20.4 of the Development Code. (Transportation/KR)
45. Ensure all site improvements, including grading and landscaping are completed in accordance with plans marked "Exhibit A", except as modified by the decision making authority in conditions of approval. (Planning Div./SR)
46. Ensure construction of all buildings, walls, fences and other structures are completed in accordance with the elevations and plans marked "Exhibit A", except as modified by the decision making authority in conditions of approval. (Planning Div./SR)
47. Ensure all landscaping approved by the decision making authority is installed. (Planning Div./SR)
48. Ensure all landscape areas are served by an underground landscape irrigation system. For approved xeriscape (drought-tolerant) landscape designs and for the installation of native or riparian plantings, underground irrigation is not required provided that temporary above-ground irrigation is provided for the establishment period. (Planning Div./SR)
49. Ensure that the planting of all approved deciduous trees, except for street trees or vegetation approved in the public right-of-way, has occurred. Deciduous trees shall have straight trunks and be fully branched, with a minimum caliper of 1-1/4 inches and a minimum height of 8 feet at the time of planting, except that dwarf and compact varieties may be may be approved at any size. Deciduous trees may be supplied bare root provided the roots are protected against damage. Each tree is to be adequately staked. (Planning Div./SR)
50. All mechanical units, roof or ground mounted, must be screened from view of public streets and adjacent properties. (Planning Div./SR)

**E. Prior to release of performance security, the applicant shall:**

51. Have completed the site development improvements as determined by the City Engineer and met all outstanding conditions of approval as determined by the City Engineer and Planning Director. Additionally, the applicant and professional(s) of record shall have met all obligations under the City Standard Agreement to Construct

Improvements and Retain Design Professional Registered in Oregon, as determined by the City Engineer. (Site Development Div./JJD)

52. Submit any required on-site easements not already granted, executed and ready for recording, to the City after approval by the City Engineer for area encumbered and City Attorney as to form. The applicant's engineer or surveyor shall verify all pre-existing and proposed easements are of sufficient width to meet City standards. (Site Development Div./JJD)
53. Provide evidence of a post-construction cleaning, system maintenance, and StormFilter recharge/replacement per manufacturer's recommendations for the project's proprietary storm water treatment systems by a CONTECH qualified maintenance provider as determined by the City Engineer. Additionally, another servicing report from the maintenance provider will be required prior to release of the required maintenance (warranty) security. (Site Development Div./JJD)
54. Provide an additional performance security for 100 percent of the cost of plants, planting materials, and any maintenance labor (including irrigation) necessary to achieve establishment/replacement of the vegetation and restoration of full function within the private surface water management facility area, as determined by the City Engineer. If the plants are not well established or the facility not properly functioning (as determined by the City Engineer) within a period of two years from the date of substantial completion, a plan shall be submitted by the engineer of record or landscape architect that documents any needed remediation. The remediation plan shall be completely implemented and deemed satisfactory by the City Engineer prior to release of the security. (Site Development Div./JJD)
55. Obtain a Finaled Washington County Facility Permit, contingent upon the following:
  - a) The road improvements required in condition 22. above shall be completed and accepted by Washington County.
  - b) Traffic signal at the intersection of THPRD Park's access and SW Huntington Avenue shall be completed and accepted by the County. (WaCo/NV)
56. Ensure that frontage improvements to Cedar Hills Boulevard are constructed, consistent with the City of Beaverton Transportation System Plan. (Planning Div./SR)

**Cedar Hills Park Redevelopment New Conditional Use (CU2017-0001):**

1. Approval of CU2017-0002 is subject to approval of DR2017-0002 and TP2017-0001. (Planning/SR)
2. The Conditional Use permit shall run with the land and shall continue to be valid upon a change of ownership of the site unless otherwise specified in conditions attached to the permit. (Planning/SR)

**Cedar Hills Park Redevelopment Tree Plan Two (TP2017-0001):**

1. Approval of TP2017-0002 is subject to approval of DR2017-0002 and CU2017-0001. (Planning/SR)

**A. Prior to project completion and during all construction on site, the applicant shall:**

2. In accordance with Section 50.90.1 of the Development Code, Tree Plan approval shall expire 2 years after the date of approval unless, prior to that time, a construction permit has been issued and substantial construction pursuant thereto has taken place, or an application for extension has been filed, pursuant to Section 50.93 of the Development Code, or authorized development has otherwise commenced in accordance with Section 50.90.3.B of the Development Code. (Planning/SR)
3. All grading outside the limit of work line (as shown on sheets SP101-SP109 of the Tree Plan Two drawings, dated June 30, 2017) shall be done using hand tools and under the direct supervision of the project arborist. (Planning/SR)
4. Continually keep up and in the same location all hard line orange fencing protecting root zones of specified trees to be saved—defined as the dripline plus 5 feet—of each Protected Tree to be preserved, whether on the subject property or on a neighboring property. The following development shall not be permitted outside the limit of work line (as shown on sheets SP101-SP109 of the Tree Plan Two drawings, dated June 30, 2017):
  - a. Construction or placement of new buildings.
  - b. Grade change or cut and fill, except where hand excavation is explicitly approved with the submittal of an arborist's report, as part of application approval.
  - c. New impervious surfaces.
  - d. Trenching for utilities, irrigation, or drainage.
  - e. Staging or storage of any kind.
  - f. Vehicle maneuvering or parking. (Planning/SR)
5. Recommendations as contained in the report prepared by the consulting arborist Mike Fontenot, dated June 2017, specifically under subsection headed "Tree Protection During Construction" are adopted as conditions of approval. Any recommended mitigation measures or construction methods to reduce or eliminate adverse effects on the trees shall be incorporated into the construction documents and shown on the approved Site Development Permit plans. (Planning/SR)

**B. Prior to release of performance security, the applicant shall:**

6. Record a conservation and maintenance easement for the remaining Significant Grove, permitting maintenance and replacement of all amenities within the easements, but prohibiting additional expansion of amenities. This easement language shall be reviewed by the Community Development Department, Public Works Department, and City Attorney's office before recording.



WASHINGTON COUNTY  
OREGON

July 5, 2017

Steve Regner, Associate Planner  
City of Beaverton  
Planning Department  
12725 SW Millikan Way  
Beaverton, OR 97076

RECEIVED

JUL 05 2017

City of Beaverton  
Planning Services

**RE: Cedar Hills Park Redevelopment – Walker Road Future Improvements**

Dear Steve:

This letter serves as the County's commitment to improve Walker Road east of Cedar Hills Blvd as part of our programmed Cedar Hills/Walker Road Intersection project, which will be funded through MSTIP. This project alleviates the need for the Beaverton School District and Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District to construct a full half-width widening on the north side of Walker Road along their frontage. However, the applicants will be required to submit a design exception to the County for the interim sidewalk (as shown on the attached plan) along a portion of the Walker Road frontage, and for any associated sidewalk/crosswalk closures.

Please let me know if you have any questions about the future County improvement plans for the SW Cedar Hills Blvd/Walker Road intersection.

Sincerely,

Gary Stockhoff, P.E.  
County Engineer

Department of Land Use and Transportation · Engineering and Construction Services Division  
Capital Project Management Section

1400 SW Walnut Street, MS 18, Hillsboro, OR 97123-5625  
Phone: (503) 846-7800 · Fax: (503) 846-7810

I would like to voice my opposition to design aspects of case file CU2017-0002 DR2017-0004 TP2017-0002. The main concern which I have is the new access and traffic signal at SW Cedar Hills and Huntington avenue. Building a road for primary access to a school through a busy park is an inherent design flaw. I although I would prefer no road through the park be build, at a minimum I ask that the design be flexible to allow primary school access through Lynnfield Ln, given the planned improvements at its intersection of Walker Rd.

I'm disappointed in the failure of the applicants to work with Washington County on this project, as there are now planned improvements for nearby Walker Road, including improved access with a left turn signal at Lynnfield Ln. The current poorly-signaled intersection at Walker Rd and Lynnfield Ln was the main driver for the design of the primary school access road via the extension of Huntington Dr. Now that we know that Walker/Lynnfield is going to be improved, it would make sense to eventually allow primary access through Lynnfield, and avoid excess traffic through the park.

There are obvious safety issues to having a busy road through a park, with a main concern being that a park user could be struck by vehicles traveling on the road. Although I understand there are devices in place to decrease the speed of vehicular speed, in general it is poor design form to place a road through an area busy with pedestrians. Currently, the area through which the road is planned is heavily used by park goers and picnickers, who often give their children free reign over the park grounds.

Placing a road through the park for the purpose of primary school access will have deleterious consequences and will lead to decreased usability. This includes air and noise pollution for park users and the nearby neighborhood on 121<sup>st</sup> Pl. To date, more than 200 park users have signed a petition asking for changes to the proposal, mostly over opposition to the proposed road and the traffic it will bring.

I understand the construction of the new Lynnfield/Walker intersection is likely to be after construction of the school and park projects. But if the new road and intersection are going to be permitted, I ask for a design of the school which allows for primary access via Lynnfield Ln, to minimize the impact on Cedar Hills Park.

Regards,

Nicholas Nelson  
2645 SW 121<sup>st</sup> Pl  
Beaverton, OR 97005  
(434)9874177

RECEIVED RECEIVED

JUN 23 2017

City of Beaverton  
Planning Services

JUN 23 2017

City of Beaverton  
Planning Services